

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ADMINISTRATION FISCAL 1984
PROPOSALS

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, the administration's budget for fiscal year 1984 contains many objectionable sections, but the one which I wish to address today concerns the proposals for drastic changes in the Civil Service Retirement System. These proposals constitute another episode in the administration's ongoing politically motivated attacks on the Federal employee. In its recommendations to the House Budget Committee, the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on which I serve has rejected these unfair proposals, and I fully support the committee position on this issue. For the benefit of my colleagues, I would like to insert in the RECORD copies of the administration's proposals, and the position of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee on them. The documents follow:

ADMINISTRATION FISCAL 1984 PROPOSALS

Federal employee retirement and disability.—Federal employee retirement and disability programs include a number of Federal employee retirement programs in the legislative, judicial, and executive branches. The largest program is the civil service retirement and disability program. Outlays for Federal employee retirement and disability are estimated to increase from \$20.9 billion in 1983 to \$22.2 billion in 1984.

Retirement and disability programs.—The Federal employee retirement system is one of the most generous pension plans available in the United States. Workers' contributions cover only 20% of the cost of the system; the Federal taxpayer pays the remaining 80%.

Legislation is proposed that would reform the civil service system to deal with the problems created by these factors. This legislative package includes:

Annuity adjustment for early retirement.—Current law provides that civil service employees may retire as early as age 55 with 30 years service and receive full benefits. By contrast, social security provides no retirement benefits before age 62. The proposal would continue to permit retirement at age 55 with 30 years service, but annuities would be reduced by an actuarial factor—5% for each year the worker chooses to retire prior to age 65. This change would be phased in over a period of 10 years, and employees age 55 or over at enactment would not be affected. The proposal is a responsible, measured way to address the early retirement problem. Since the average age at which Federal employees retire is 61, few will experience the full reduction. In addition, the reduc-

tion would not apply to persons retiring because of disability.

Cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs).—As part of a proposed Government-wide COLA policy, this proposal would freeze the cost-of-living adjustment for 1984. The proposal would also make permanent the current limitation on cost-of-living adjustments (COLAs) for non-disability retirees under age 62 by allowing one-half the full COLA increase after 1985. Under current law, the limitation of one-half of specified COLA increases expires at the end of fiscal year 1985.

Increase employee deductions for retirement.—Although retirement costs have skyrocketed, the amount withheld from Federal employees' salaries has remained constant at 7% since 1969. This has resulted in a significant departure from the principle that employees should pay 50% of the cost of the retirement system. The proposal would increase employee deductions to 9% in 1984 and to 11% in 1985. This represents approximately one-half of the cost of civil service retirement, taking into account the other reforms proposed.

Increase employer deductions for retirement.—Employer contributions for retirement would also increase to match the increase in employee deductions described above. This would include matching contributions from other entities including the U.S. Postal Service, and the District of Columbia Government, for employees who participate in the Civil Service Retirement System.

Base annuity calculations on the retirees' highest 5 years of earnings, instead of the current highest 3.—As recently as 1969, the formula for computing annuities was based on the average of an employee's 5 highest salary years; since then the three highest salary year have been used. With a return to more moderate inflation levels, it is sensible to use the highest 5 years as the base. Employees within 3 years of retirement eligibility would not be affected by the change.

Modify replacement rates.—Currently, a formula is used that determines the percentage of salary that is replaced by retirement benefits. For example, this replacement rate is now 56.25% of the final 3 years' salary for 30 years of service. The administration would alter this formula to reduce the replacement rate, if necessary in conjunction with other proposals, to reduce the cost of the system to 22% of payroll and enable employer contributions to be limited to 11% of salary.

Federal employees workers' compensation.—Federal employees or their survivors are provided tax-free cash and medical benefits for job-related injuries, illnesses, or deaths. About 47,000 workers with long-term disabilities, or their survivors are expected to receive monthly payments in 1984. This is 1,000 fewer than in 1983 because of increased efforts to return recipients to work and to remove those no longer eligible from the rolls. Outlays are estimated to decrease from \$218 million in 1983 to \$211 million in 1984 as a result of the proposal to delay the cost-of-living increase for 1 year.

COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICE AND CIVIL SERVICE
VIEWS AND RECOMMENDATIONS ON PRO-
GRAMS UNDER COMMITTEE'S JURISDICTION

I. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT COLA

Administration proposal.—The Administration proposes to save approximately \$2 billion over the next three years by eliminating the COLA due in May 1984. Civil service annuitants would receive the April 1983 COLA but would not receive another COLA until June 1985—a 13-month delay.

Committee position.—There is no justifiable basis to treat Federal retirees more harshly than beneficiaries of other Federal entitlement programs. The Administration proposes only a six-month delay in COLA for social security recipients and other beneficiaries. The Administration's budget contains no explanation for the difference in treatment. A 13-month COLA delay for Federal retirees clearly is inequitable. The Budget Committee should assume only that amount of savings that would result from imposing the same six-month COLA delay on Federal retirees as is proposed for social security recipients.

(Note.—An amendment offered in full Committee to substitute the Administration's COLA proposal for the Committee recommendation was rejected by a record vote of 3 to 19.)

II. PAY FREEZE

Administration proposal.—The Administration proposes to save \$3.3 billion in FY 1984 by eliminating the October 1983 pay increase, estimated at 6.5 percent by the Administration and 5.5 percent by CBO.

Committee position.—The Federal employees' pay increase has been capped the past five years. As of October 1982, they were 14.47 percent behind the private sector and, under the pay comparability provisions of existing law, may be as much as 22 percent behind by next October. Last year's four percent increase generally was eaten up by the medicare tax and increased health insurance premiums, resulting in a reduction in take-home pay for many employees. At a minimum, Federal employees should receive the four percent increase assumed in last year's budget resolution. This would result in savings of from \$750 million to \$9 billion depending on whose estimate of comparability is used.

(Note.—An amendment offered in full Committee to substitute the Administration's pay freeze proposal for the Committee recommendation was rejected by a record vote of 4 to 18.)

III. CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT REVISIONS

Administration proposed.—The Administration proposes drastic reform of the civil service retirement system including:

Increasing employee contributions from 7 percent to 9 percent in 1984 and from 9 percent to 11 percent in 1985;

Reducing annuities by 5 percent for each year the employee is under age 65 at the time of retirement;

Calculating annuities on the basis of highest average salary over five years rather than three years; and

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by the Member on the floor.

Modifying the formula for computing annuities.

Committee position.—The civil service retirement system has been under attack since 1976 when Congress repealed the one percent add-on to each COLA. This constant chipping away of benefits has resulted in a total reduction in benefits of \$6.7 billion. The Committee does not intend to consider the Administration's retirement proposals at this time. The proposal to extend social security coverage to certain Federal employees and the impact of such proposal on the civil service retirement system are more imminent problems the Committee will have to address in the 98th Congress.

IV. FEDERAL EMPLOYEE HEALTH BENEFITS

Administration proposal.—The Administration proposes a major restructuring of the FEHB program. Under the proposal each employee would receive a fixed dollar amount towards the purchase of health insurance. The amount would be based on the average Government contribution for employee health insurance in 1983, indexed in future years to reflect price increases. However, the proposed index would not reflect the substantial annual increases in health care costs. Our preliminary information shows that the average Government contribution for employee health benefits in fiscal year 1984 would be reduced by \$172. Existing law which limits the number of participating plans would be repealed.

Committee position.—We have witnessed a steady erosion of Federal employee health benefits under the present Administration. Premiums have increased an average of 55 percent and the overall level of benefits has substantially decreased. According to a study conducted by William M. Mercer, Inc., the value of benefits under the FEHB now falls below the average value of benefits received by employees in the private sector and state government plans. While changes in the FEHB are warranted, it is clear that the sole objective of this Administration with respect to the FEHB is simply to reduce outlays—not improve the program. Our Committee prefers to achieve savings through program improvements and not through arbitrary cuts in the Government's contribution.

V. CLASSIFICATION REVIEW

Administration proposals.—The President's budget assumed savings of \$700 million resulting from a review of the manner in which Federal jobs are classified.

Committee position.—The Budget Committee should not assume savings of \$700 million resulting from the proposed classification review since the President's assumed savings are undocumented, and the Committee does not believe that such savings can be realized under existing provisions of law.●

TRIBUTE TO TIMOTHY HUNT

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, I have been saddened to learn of the death at the young age of 20 of Mr. Timothy Hunt of Montclair, N.J. Tim came to work in my office as an intern late in 1981, and he immediately made his cheerful, cooperative, and energetic personality into a major asset to the

staff, constituents, and visitors who came into contact with him. He worked hard and loved being here and learning about the Congress. Although illness cut short his time with us, he looked forward to returning in the next summer, and he kept in touch with calls and visits to the office which were always welcome. Tim Hunt earned our affection and respect.

Born in Glen Ridge, N.J., Tim was valedictorian of his graduating class at Montclair High School. He went on to become an honor student at the Georgetown School of Foreign Service, preparing for what surely would have been a distinguished career in the service of our country.

Our deepest sympathy goes to Tim's parents, Donald and Maxine Hunt; his sisters, Laura Claire Hunt and Marcia Carol Goldberg; and his grandmother, Anne Hunt. His presence in my office gave some idea of the loss they suffer. It is also our country's loss, since Tim was a good citizen and a good man whose strong character and kind disposition promised much for the future.●

WHO SHALL SPEAK?

HON. PETER H. KOSTMAYER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. KOSTMAYER. Mr. Speaker, the notion of a free and open exchange of ideas is an American cliché. This tolerance for the diversity and variety of human opinion goes to the soul of American life.

Yet twice recently, this administration—which constantly reminds us of its commitment to getting the Government off our backs, has assaulted this historic process in the name of "national security."

The Department of Justice has invoked an obscure provision of the Foreign Agents Registration Act requiring three Canadian films recently released in this country to carry a disclaimer stating that they have been registered with the Department of Justice but that this registration "does not indicate approval of the contents of this material by the United States Government." Furthermore, records will be kept of the names of groups, schools, libraries, and private institutions that have asked to see the films.

This intrusive and intimidating conduct has no place in a free society.

The Justice Department should not render political judgments that are better made by American citizens. Rather, it should concern itself with crime, not the dissemination of ideas.

Fresh from rescuing us from the Canadian films, the administration discovered yet another threat in the form of 68-year-old Hortensia Allende, the

widow of the late Chilean President, Salvador Allende. She was denied a visa to travel from her home in Mexico City to speak to church groups in San Francisco on the subject of human rights and women's rights. The State Department said her presence in this country would be prejudicial to the interests of the United States.

It has never been in the interests of the people of the United States for the Government to decide who shall speak and who shall not.

Contrary to what the administration says, it is they, not Mrs. Allende or the Canadian films, which pose the real danger to America.●

REFUNDABILITY OF THE DEPENDENT CARE TAX CREDIT

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be joined by my colleagues Mr. SHANNON and Mr. DOWNEY to introduce legislation making the dependent care tax credit refundable. This legislation is directed toward the needs of low-income families—families caught in the earnings gap between two forms of child care assistance. These are families who are working and earning too much to qualify for AFDC or title XX child care programs but who do not earn enough to benefit from the tax credit program.

A refundable credit will allow families to receive a refund in the amount of the credit they could have claimed had they earned enough to pay income taxes.

The benefit of assisting low-income earners through the Tax Code rather than through other forms of Federal subsidies is that the choice or appropriate child care remains with the family. The refundability provision will reimburse families for a portion of their child care expenses regardless of whether they send their children to a child care center in the neighborhood church or hire the children's grandparent to stay with the children after school.

This bill is part of the Women's Economic Equity Act, introduced today in both the House and the Senate. I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.●

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1983, the House of Repre-

sentatives voted overwhelmingly in support of House Resolution 16, legislation creating the Select Committee on Children, Youth, and Families. Had I been present for that vote, I would have voted in favor of this resolution.●

SUPPORTERS OF H.R. 1310

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, with the passage of H.R. 1310 on March 2, this body displayed overwhelming support for a Federal initiative to boost mathematics and science education. Many Members voted for H.R. 1310, but I would like to call special attention to 33 Members whose active involvement and strong advocacy contributed greatly to this legislation.

These 33 Members had requested to become cosponsors of H.R. 1310. Unfortunately, confusion over the cosponsorship deadline, stemming from the unusual circumstances of this bill being referred to and marked up by two committees, prevented their cosponsorship from being officially recorded.

I wish to commend these Members for their good work on this bill and emphasize that the Education and Labor Committee considers them to be original cosponsors of H.R. 1310. Their names follow:

Robert G. Torricelli; Robert Durbin; Rod Chandler; Dan Glickman; Joe Skeen; Barbara Boxer; Ron de Lugo; Mickey Leland; Lee H. Hamilton; Timothy J. Penny; Mary Rose Oaker; Frank McCloskey; William H. Gray; Byron Dorgan; Mel Levine; William Goodling; George Gekas; Douglas Bereuter; Sam Gejdenson; Gerry Sikorski; Tim Valentine; Jerry Patterson; Alan Mollohan; Robert Roe; Robert Young; Harold Volmer; Stanley Lundine; Norman Mineta; Harry Reid; Michael Andrews; James Scheuer; Julian Dixon; and Ike Skelton.●

TIMES NEWS TO MARK 100 YEARS

HON. GUS YATRON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. YATRON. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1983, the Times News, published by Pencor Services, Inc., from Lehigh, Pa., will celebrate its 100th anniversary. The staff of this outstanding newspaper is to be commended in the highest manner for the service they have so long provided to their approximately 60,000 readers in Carbon, Lehigh, Monroe, Northampton, and Schuylkill Counties, 6 days a week.

From its beginning in 1883, when it was established from the consolidation

of the Times News, Jim Thorpe, Pa., the Evening Record, Lansford, Pa., and the Evening Courier, Tamaqua, Pa., this newspaper has exemplified the finest in journalistic principles and standards.

Week after week, in issue after issue, the Times News creates and maintains a tradition of informing its readers and serving its community in a most comprehensive and excellent manner. Never relinquishing responsibility, the Times News has sought the truth in its articles and has carried out its duties faithfully and conscientiously. Serving as a symbol of basic constitutional liberty, this newspaper makes clear the reason behind our free speech and press. For 100 years the Times News has shown its courage, wisdom, and commitment to the highest principles while imparting concern for and dedication to the well-being of the citizens of its community.

I know that my colleagues will join me in expressing our deepest appreciation to Mr. Donald G. Reinhard, president and chairman of the board of Pencor Services, Inc.; Mr. Fred L. Masenheimer, general manager of the Times News; Mr. Conrad A. Sthare, assistant to the general manager; and the entire staff. I believe that all who have been touched by this publication's meritorious work will commend the Times News on its 100th anniversary and express our joint hope that its service will continue for many years to come. For as Thomas Jefferson observed, "When the press is free and every man able to read, all is safe."●

TURNING OVER NATIONAL WEATHER SERVICE TO PRIVATE SECTOR IS ILL-CONCEIVED PROPOSAL

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, last week, Commerce Secretary Malcolm Baldrige issued his Department's annual report for 1982. In that report, Secretary Baldrige described the National Weather Service as an agency which "issues forecasts and warnings vital to public safety and the Nation's economy." A little later in the same report, the Secretary characterized the National Environmental Satellite, Data, and Information Service in the following manner: It "operates the country's operational environmental satellites systems and collects, stores, and disseminates essential environmental records from all sources for use by science and industry." He went on to say the improvements in this agency will "improve services for the food and energy industry."

Now all of us may have disagreements about what Government program are or are not in the national interest. But I would have thought that basic weather information, accurate forecasts, timely weather warnings, and "essential environmental records" are things that all of us, despite party, could agree were in the national interest, and deserving of a commitment of Federal funding.

This, however, turns out not to be the case. The March 8, 1983, issue of the Washington Post contains a story which indicates that the administration, following its creed that there is no function for Government in any area, has decided it wants to sell off not only our weather satellites, but an as yet unnamed other major portion of our entire National Weather Service.

There may be, probably most assuredly are, areas of Government involvement which could sensibly be turned over to the private sector. But to my mind the National Weather Service is certainly not one of them. Talk to a farmer who depends on accurate, timely weather information and see if he wants it turned over to a private company, which will cut corners to turn a profit. Talk to a resident of my State of South Dakota, who has to travel on isolated roads in winter and see if he wants to trust in private enterprise to tell him if the roads are going to be passable. Talk to anyone who has been through a tornado warning, and ask them if prompt weather bulletins should not be something that is in the national interest.

This is, quite plainly, one of the dumbest ideas I have ever heard, and I intend to do all I can to see that this pipedream is buried as quickly as possible.

If there is any saving grace to this idiocy, it is that humor columnists will be able to write quite a few entertaining columns about this ill-conceived proposal. Though Art Buchwald has not had time to get around to it yet, the March 9 issue of the Post contains a column by Judy Mann which amply demonstrates that, if nothing else, this proposal is at least good for a laugh. The only danger is that it could actually happen. And that would be no laughing matter.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 8, 1983]

UNITED STATES CONSIDERS SELLING PARTS OF WEATHER SERVICE TO PRIVATE SIDE

(By Philip J. Hilts)

The Reagan administration is considering selling parts of the nation's weather service to private companies.

A Cabinet recommendation to take the first step by selling the nation's land, ocean, and weather satellites is already on President Reagan's desk, John V. Byrne, administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, said yesterday.

The Cabinet Council on Commerce and Trade, chaired by Secretary of Commerce Malcolm Baldrige, in December recommended asking "the Department of Commerce to oversee the transfer of the civil operational weather, land, and future ocean satellites to the U.S. domestic private sector as soon as possible," according to minutes of the Dec. 15 council meeting."

At the same time, NOAA is reviewing the operation of the National Weather Service and other parts of the agency—including weather monitoring stations all over the United States, and weather analysis and forecasting operations—to decide what part of the services also can be turned over to private companies by sale or contract.

Though land-viewing satellites were long expected to become commercial enterprises, the move to "privatize" weather satellites and parts of the national weather service could fundamentally change century-old international agreements for free sharing of weather data among 100 nations of the world.

Proposals to "commercialize" parts of the nation's weather service have caused concern among other nations as well as weather scientists in this country. They and the news media now receive weather data and satellite photographs without cost and depend on them for storm warnings and other information.

Representative James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.) has asked the General Accounting Office to study whether such a sale can take place without the consent of Congress. In any case, Byrne has said in writing that no action would be taken without congressional approval.

The chief rationale for selling the weather and land-viewing satellites, one former NOAA official said, is that the United States is quickly falling behind other nations in the commercial exploitation of satellites for agriculture and mineral and oil exploration. France and Japan both are planning to launch commercial satellites to take and sell land pictures. Neither has announced any interest in operating commercial weather satellites.

One university scientist said selling the weather satellite system to a private company could harm the work of professional weather researchers and reduce the quality of data gathered if profit becomes the primary motive. "The whole system could be permanently disabled," he said.

Another scientist, Robert Fleagle, a professor of atmospheric sciences at the University of Washington, said selling of the satellites appears to be only one part of the commercialization of many parts of NOAA that "could come down to dismantling a good portion of the country's weather services."

Since weather monitoring, data analysis and forecasting require a large, well-coordinated organization, he said, "A lack of a government infrastructure would really be a serious thing. A commercial outfit itself would just not have the raw material to work with."

A Canadian official said his government also was "very concerned" about the satellites being sold to private companies. Noting that the U.S. government already sells non-weather satellite data, he said, "We have a satellite looking down at our country and we don't call it a spy satellite because we have non-discriminatory access to it. . . . But if we were charged 100 times as much by some company, then we might begin to wonder about this."

"Meteorological data has traditionally been free," he added. "Everything that a country gathers is thrown into the pot to make the world weather system work."

Because of its large land masses, Canada spends five times as much as the United States per capita on weather monitoring, with much of the Canadian data becoming part of the daily weather forecast for parts of the United States.

Scheuer said that Congress would have to take "a long and careful look" at any Reagan administration proposal.

"The only serious proposal so far [from the commercial satellite firm Comsat] could cost the government well over \$300 million per year [in subsidies], and that may be significantly more than the government now pays for these services, or to provide these data," Scheuer said.

Of the approximately 12,000 employees at NOAA, the jobs of 3,500 will be reviewed for "commercializing," according to NOAA official William J. Coleman. That figure does not count the possible satellite sale. By one Congressional estimate, 40 percent of the entire agency may be considered for "commercializing."

Byrne said that the White House has not made a decision on selling the satellites or parts of the weather service. But he said the proposed changes are all "geared to a leaner, harder, more efficient operation" of the government.

"I don't think there is any question that in the future we are not going to continue doing business as we have in the past," he said. "The changes are more significant than they have been in the past. When you look at the federal deficit, you can see we've got to do something."

He said service agencies have to be considered candidates to be turned over to commercial hands.

"In some cases someone ought to be able to make a profit on some of these things," Byrne said.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1983]

JUDY MANN: WEATHER BIZ

Having done such a terrific job of handling the agency charged with protecting the environment, the Reagan administration has turned its sights to the heavens: In its search for money, it has seized upon the idea of selling off some of our forecasting and monitoring satellites and parts of the National Weather Service to—you got it—private industry.

This news, I have to tell you, came as something of a shock. I am one of those people who grew up after the federal government decided to have a weather service in 1870, and I had come to sort of count on it. I've always operated on the assumption that the weather was something that belonged to all of us, for better or worse, and that information about it was something that government provided in the trust sense of public service.

The satellites the administration proposes to sell have been used by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration and other government agencies to generate scientific data about the ocean, the state of crops, volcanic activity, mineral resources, and weather activity around the world.

NOAA's weather data is supplied to a variety of users, including newspapers, television and radio stations at little or no cost. But instead of generating revenue for the government by simply charging commercial users a handsome fee for the weather service information, the Reagan administration

is proposing to dismantle a complex international pool of scientific information.

Think of the possible consequences.

One afternoon, the local weatherman rushes from his hairdresser to the TV station, dials the National Weather Service for the latest information, and gets the bad news. "What do you mean you're not going to give me your weather forecast?"

"Sorry, pal," says the voice on the other end. "We sent you a telegram last week telling you we'd bought part of the weather service and it's a whole new ball game. This information is now the property of the Maryland-Delaware Weather Protection Corp., and you're not about to find this private enterprise subsidizing your private enterprise. From now on, your station has to fork over \$250,000 a year to get our weather forecasts."

"You've got to be kidding."

"Hey, you don't like our prices, try the competition. That's what free enterprise is all about, pal."

The weatherman hastily dials the Virginia Weather Development Project, a joint venture formed by a group of Fairfax zoning attorneys who decided to cash in on the weather since land was moving slowly. VWDP's president was shocked. "Two hundred and fifty grand? That's not free enterprise. That's larceny. We're supplying the weather to customers like you for a mere \$200,000 a year, which barely covers our satellite costs, you understand."

"Two hundred thousand?"

"Right. See, only one phone call and you saved your station \$50,000. There's only one hitch."

"What's that?"

"We only give Virginia weather."

In desperation, our weatherman calls the phone company. A metallic voice comes on. "Good Morning. The weather forecast has been discontinued. Customers wishing to know the weather are being referred to SuperWeather." The weatherman dials the SuperWeather phone number. "Good morning! This is SuperWeather, a new satellite service that beams directly into your home via a television scrambling device that is yours for only \$78 a month, plus installation and a one-month deposit. SuperWeather gives you the latest forecasts for Washington, D.C., and will offer beach weather information beginning in May for a modest additional charge."

It should be noted that while selling the weather service to industry might be good for business, the Reagan administration has produced no figures indicating that it will be good for the public. The evidence it has presented so far shows this scheme will, in fact, cost the government millions. Doubtless, the administration will soon clear up the confusion about what it is really up to in this daffy scheme by announcing in sonorous tones: "It's time to get the federal government out of the weather business!"

In fact, it's time for the general public to get into the weather business and the environment business and to start worrying about whether the scientific, data-gathering functions of government will be able to weather this administration.

REAGAN'S SATELLITE SELLOFF WOULD RIP OFF TAXPAYERS

(By Hobart Rowen)

The Reagan Administration is hereby awarded the Nobel Prize for chutzpah. What other president would have the nerve to suggest selling the government's five

weather and land-resource satellites to a private company at a big loss, and guarantee its profits for 15 years while it buys the information back from the private company?

What other administration would strip its budget for funds for two Landsat satellites, crippling the program, and then claim it must transfer operations to the private sector to stay competitive with France and Japan?

What is involved here, as consumer advocate Ralph Nader said, "is a rip-off of the American taxpayer." Congress ought to let President Reagan know promptly that it makes no sense. "This is a grotesque giveaway; What's next?" asked Nader. "Maybe they'll sell the FBI investigative services to the Wackenhut detective agency."

The real outrage is not so much that the government and taxpayers are certain to suffer an economic loss. It's the crass willingness of the Reaganites to let weather information, which should be available to all citizens as a community service, degenerate into an ordinary commodity to be trafficked in for profit.

Information on land resources and weather is critical for the health and safety of everybody. Yet we are now verging into a system where only those who have the money to pay for certain specialized information will get it. Snapped National Farmers Union representative Robert Denman: "This is symptomatic of this administration. It becomes a windfall for private weather organizations."

Reagan's plan is justified by White House press aide Larry Speakes on the dubious proposition that the satellites "would be better operated by the private sector." It calls for getting rid of the nation's four weather satellites and Landsat, the one satellite now operating to survey the Earth for crop and other resource information. Three ground-control stations would also be part of the deal.

Even the notion that the government would take bids is something of a sham and charade, because one company, the Communications Satellite Corp. (Comsat), appears to have the inside track for the sweetheart deal being arranged. If it goes through, Comsat will have a monopoly on selling weather information, and the Reagan administration will have perpetrated a mockery of the free-enterprise system.

The whole stupid proposal originated because the budget-pruners at the OMB, after having messed up the Landsat program by ill-conceived cuts in funding, decided that it would dump these remote-sensing satellites altogether. When no private company came forward to pick up Landsat, Comsat, which is not operated by fools, offered to take Landsat in a package deal if the government tossed in the weather satellites. The government would then guarantee that Comsat would not lose money by buying both weather and land information from it for the next 15 years.

What we see here is the ultimate idiocy of the hard-core antigovernment philosophy of the Reagan administration—the theory that the less government the better, and the best government is none at all.

The notion that a private company could manage the satellites more efficiently is totally unproved. As a matter of fact, officials at the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, which operates the five satellites, told reporters after the White House announcement they couldn't confirm that selling the satellites would save any money.

To launch these satellites into orbit cost the American taxpayers at least \$1.6 billion.

No one in the Reagan administration will say what the government might get back, but you can be certain that it won't be much. (Comsat would like to pay about \$300 million.) By guaranteeing the buyer a profit, NOAA officials concede that the government stands to lose hundreds of millions of dollars a year.

Consumer groups, like Nader's, are quite sure that the real effect will be either to raise the cost of getting weather information to those who had been getting it without cost before, or to reduce the general availability of vital data. Scientists express concern that in the hands of a private company, which must pay attention to bottom-line profits, some critical research will get short shrift.

And how about the Coast Guard? Since its own satellite isn't working, it's been getting weather information from NOAA. Must the Coast Guard now rely on a private company? Maybe we can sell the Coast Guard itself. And then, there's the Pentagon. Please look into that, David Stockman.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE FOR SOVIET JEWS

HON. ROBERT T. MATSUI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, as part of the Call to Conscience for Soviet Jews, I would like to call your attention to the continued difficulties experienced by Yakov and Tatiana Kogan, who have been denied permission to immigrate to Israel for the past 6 years. The Kogans are of special concern to me because they have been adopted by the Jewish community in my district of Sacramento, Calif.

Yakov Kogan was a member of the Soviet Army until 1969, when he completed his service. Because of his security clearance, Yakov agreed to sign a document stating he would be unable to go abroad for 5 years; 6 years later when he applied for permission to emigrate, however, he was refused on the basis of his army service. His application was turned down again 6 months later.

Tatiana Kogan lost her job when it was learned that she and her husband had applied for emigration visas.

When the Kogans were adopted by the Sacramento community in August 1982, I joined many local citizens in writing to Soviet officials on their behalf. So far, the only response has been a short letter from the Kogans to one of my constituents. No official word has been received and the Kogans continue to be denied the ability to be reunited in Israel with Tatiana's parents and sister.

It is my hope that through our efforts here in Congress with the Call to Conscience Vigil and through efforts in our local communities, the Kogans and other Soviet Jews will be given permission at last to emigrate from the Soviet Union.●

SHIPPING ACT OF 1983

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, I have recently reintroduced the Shipping Act of 1983. This bill is almost identical in substance to H.R. 4374 which I introduced and which passed the House last September.

Last session, while H.R. 4374 was under active consideration by the House, three east coast newspapers published editorials opposing enactment of the bill. Despite these and other attempts to discredit the legislation, the House of Representatives passed the bill by an overwhelming margin. Because of a threatened filibuster, the Senate did not vote on the measure in the last session. However, 2 weeks ago, a very similar bill was passed by the Senate. The Subcommittee on Merchant Marine will hold a hearing on the bill next week, and I will seek early enactment of this very significant legislation.

Despite the obvious approval by both Houses of Congress—albeit, in different Congresses thus far—a small number of opponents continue to attack the bill. Many of those attacks are based on the assumption that our maritime industry operates in a domestic vacuum, while, in fact, it operates in the international shipping environment where different rules apply. Another undocumented and incorrect charge is that passage of the bill would increase costs to consumers and shippers.

I and other supporters have attempted to dispel these erroneous assumptions and misleading analyses of the Shipping Act. I am pleased to submit for the further edification of my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD a very fine letter to the editor of the New York Times by Lawrence Juda, the chairman of the graduate program in marine affairs at the University of Rhode Island. Professor Juda presents a clear and correct description of the realities of the ocean shipping industry—domestically and internationally.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 10, 1983]

PROBLEMS OF U.S. SHIPPING ARE REAL

To the Editor:

I must take issue with your editorial "Down to the Sea in Cartels" (Feb. 21), as it is more a knee-jerk response to the term cartel than it is a considered analysis of the actual situation of conferences and oceanliner shipping. The problems of the United States cargo fleet are not modest but, in fact, substantial in nature.

The relative decline of the United States fleet participation in the carriage of American trade is a consequence of a number of factors. There can be no denying that it is a

high-cost fleet in terms of labor and, in the past, requirements to build at home.

Yet it may also not be denied that the fleet has been damaged by the existing regulatory system which results in an excess of carrying capacity in the United States trades and which undercuts efforts at rationalization: that is, cooperation among shipping lines so as to minimize excess capacity and improve load factors.

The U.S.-flag fleet has also been damaged by the presence of foreign government-owned and/or subsidized lines as well as the operation of closed conferences in non-United States trades which limit opportunities for American-flag operators to act as cross-traders between foreign ports.

The Shipping Act of 1916 exempted liner conferences from United States antitrust laws while it made those bodies subject to the regulation of what is today the Federal Maritime Commission. The antitrust exemption granted in the 1916 act, however, has been weakened by the courts and by administrative action even in the face of Congressional intent to the contrary.

If the American liner industry is to survive, let alone prosper, it must be allowed to undertake those measures of rationalization which shipping lines in other countries practice regularly and take for granted. In fact, such measures are sometimes encouraged by foreign governmental authorities.

If the rest of the world, including other Western democracies, regulates cargo shipping differently than we do, is it not at least conceivable that our approach merits reevaluation?

LAWRENCE JUDA.●

SAVE THE HOUSING ALLOWANCE TAX DEDUCTION FOR MINISTERS

HON. STAN PARRIS

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. PARRIS. Mr. Speaker, in January, the Internal Revenue Service issued revenue ruling 83-3 which will prohibit ministers from deducting interest and taxes paid on a personal residence if those amounts are also treated as tax-exempt income. The rule will go into effect on July 1, 1983.

On March 4, 1983, I introduced H.R. 1905 which would exempt ministers from revenue ruling 83-3. This revenue ruling was originally directed toward students and veterans who were deducting education benefits from their taxes. The ruling was then expanded to include ministers, which I feel is unwarranted and an injustice.

The amount of income and housing allowance received by a minister is determined to a large degree on the size of the congregation. Smaller churches are only able to contribute so much toward the salary and expenses of their minister. In difficult economic times, ministers and others who depend on contributions find themselves struggling to make ends meet.

Ministers have come to depend on this tax deduction. To deny them this deduction now would force many

members of the clergy to endure severe financial hardship. The small amount of revenue this ruling would produce is insignificant when compared to the burden it will place on congregations and their ministers.●

GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN HILER

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HILER. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, March 25, several hundred citizens of Indiana's Third Congressional District, particularly those of Greek origin or heritage, will be celebrating Greek Independence Day.

To the inhabitants of that well-known nation in the east Mediterranean, Western civilization owes an enduring debt; because it was there, over 2,500 years ago where the philosophical foundations of democratic government were evolved.

The word "democracy," which means so much to American society, is derived from the Greek words, *demos*—meaning the people—and *kratos*—meaning authority. Even as the ancient Greeks held that authority should come from the people, the Greeks who have emigrated to the United States and particularly to northern Indiana have demonstrated to their fellow Americans that they hold this concept dear.

When we consider America's heritage of individual liberties and freedom, we would do well to remember the ideals embodied in our system of government. Inevitably, we trace these origins to the birthplace of logic, the city-states of Hellene. There, men became concerned with causes and effects, with abstract ideals of justice, and with practical concepts of equitable government with human dignity.

Our Founding Fathers were thoroughly familiar with such philosophers as Plato and Aristotle. They avidly read the works of such historians as Thucydides and Herodotus. They knew the writings of Homer and Plutarch. Our founders emulated the oratory of Demosthenes and the statesmanship of Pericles. Thus, ideas and goals upon which America was founded came, in large part, from Hellenistic culture as did the words which described them.

I am honored, Mr. Speaker, that the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association, or AHEPA, will soon be initiating me as a member of its South Bend, Ind., affiliate. I am proud to be associated with these Greek-Americans and join them in their observance of Greece's liberation from the Ottoman Turks.

It is fitting that we, who owe so much to the ancient Greeks and their

ancestors who carry the torch of enlightenment and freedom, salute them on this historic occasion.●

A LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent has asked me to call this to the attention of other Members.

It seems you may not still understand the truckers. The tax you want them to carry is not 2, 3, 4 times as much, but try 8 or more. No one can take this kind of tax increase. This tax is not to take place until 1984 or so. I guess the roads are going to drop out from under us by then. I think it is wise (that) when federal money goes into roads someone should see that the job is done right, not another rip off.

Do you really know what a person carries these days? Our government is overcharged for everything. Here is where Congress should get tough. Also remember this mess we have has come to us over many years. Too much money too free to use for too long.

Sir, you have been given your raise. Maybe you should be asked to be taxed the equivalent amount you indeed want to impose on others.

I am sure too much was in this tax bill that passed without the needed study to avoid the harm it seems to be bringing with it. It should never be impossible to vote on separate issues so vital.

Maybe you can remember a statement made back a few years. "We shall defeat you from within." The U.S. needs persons who care to get this country back on the right track (not just politicians). I just mailed letters to Congressman Lee Hamilton, Senator Richard Lugar, (and) Senator Dan Quayle about statements from the news of where a lot of the 5% tax will go. It seems not all to roads as the American people are led to believe.

Mrs. MARJORIE CARTER,
Lawrenceburg, Ind.●

SD VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, with pleasure I would like to insert the speech of the South Dakota VFW Voice of Democracy scholarship program winner, Erik Brendtro, of Crooks, S. Dak. Following is the text of Erik's speech:

In his poem "Voluntaries III" Ralph Waldo Emerson expresses his belief in the essential goodness of youth. He says, "So nigh is grandeur to our dust, So near is God to man; When duty whispers low, Thou must, The youth replies, I can." I see this poem as a call to action, challenging the youth of our country to make commit-

ments—to choose the path of involvement. Many will decline this call, choosing rather the easier path of apathy, indifference, and non-involvement. By contrast, the youth who replies "I can" commits himself to the political and social concerns which are the responsibility of all citizens. As a responsible leader of tomorrow who has accepted the call to action, I see goals to be met and problems to be solved.

Our government has granted us such fundamental rights as freedom of speech, religion, press and assembly. But along with these rights come responsibilities. Soon I will be of voting age. When that time comes, it will be my responsibility to be well-informed on the major issues, to take the time to effect good legislation, and to exercise my right to vote. Further, I should be willing to serve in office or to support the party and candidates who best represent my own beliefs. It is my responsibility to be involved, to sacrifice personal time and convenience for my country to be a doer, not a thumb-twiddler, a finger-pointer, or an excuse-finder. We, as American youth, must realize now that if we are to survive as a nation, we must show the same dedication in serving our country as we expect our country to show in serving us. In the words of Barry Goldwater, Jr., "America is not great because of what government has done for its people, but America is great because of what government has permitted its people to do for themselves."

But our commitment extends much farther than civic obligations and also includes social and personal commitment. The Greek philosopher Aristotle was convinced that the fate of nations depends upon the education of youth. Perhaps the best preparation for the future that we can make is to achieve our potential through education. Our generation faces, and will continue to face, numerous crises such as ending world hunger, eliminating the nuclear threat, and promoting world peace, to mention a few. We also have a responsibility to share our technology with underdeveloped nations in order to preserve our democracy by promoting good-will. Contrary to the popular belief that Russia is America's greatest enemy, our deadliest enemy is our own intolerance of other people and our indifference to such social ills as poverty, prejudice, and discrimination. It is my moral responsibility to safeguard the rights of others by voicing my concern whenever and wherever injustice prevails and by being unfailingly honest in my dealings.

In addition, we, the youth of America, must develop a concern not only for our own citizens, but also for people all over the world. When a massacre occurs in Lebanon, or human rights are violated in El Salvador, it is my concern. We must at least develop a sensitivity to the suffering of the world. Ellie Wiesel, a survivor of the Nazi extermination camps, recently expressed his concern about our apathy toward the oppressed. He pleaded for people to do something to show their concern—if only to say a prayer or shed a tear. My experiences as a foreign exchange student have brought me to a new awareness that people everywhere share the same concerns, hopes, fears, and dreams. This larger view of the world has helped me to realize that I share responsibility with the youth of America to do whatever I can to promote world understanding.

In the past 200 years America has survived many hardships—war, depression, corruption, and scandal. If we are to continue to survive as a nation, it will be because we

youth reject apathy and indifference and accept instead the challenges of tomorrow with a resounding "Yes" for our country.

I challenge the youth of America—If not us, who? If not now, when? Let us choose the path of commitment to our country so that when Duty whispers low, "Thou must," we youth reply, "We can." ●

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION DAY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, today, March 16, commemorates the birthday of our fourth President, James Madison. March 16 has also been designated "Freedom of Information Day."

I thought it fitting on this date to share with my colleagues the excellent speech made yesterday by the chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee, the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL. JOHN's remarks were made before the Sigma Delta Chi press fraternity, which was meeting to honor the legacy of James Madison.

In his thought-provoking commentary, JOHN examines the troubling assault on basic first amendment freedoms being launched by the administration. I commend his speech to my colleagues attention.

I also take this opportunity to bring to the attention of Members of the House an editorial by David Broder which appeared in today's Washington Post. The editorial also addresses administration efforts to curtail the free flow of information about the activities of executive branch agencies. I believe my colleagues will find in Mr. Broder's editorial some food for thought.

REMARKS OF THE HON. JOHN D. DINGELL BEFORE SIGMA DELTA CHI, THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

I believe there are more instances of the abridgement of the freedom of the people by gradual and silent encroachment of those in power than by violent and sudden usurpations.

Those prescient words spoken on the floor of the Virginia Convention on June 16th, 1788 by the statesman we are honoring here this evening have a fresh and disturbing relevance for America today.

One of the most precious freedoms we Americans have is freedom of information: the free and open exchange of information between the governed and the governors. It is a freedom grounded in the First Amendment, nurtured and strengthened by over two hundred years of conflict, tested and expanded by legislation and judicial decisions ranging back to John Peter Zenger—some 60 years before the First Amendment itself was framed—and proven by our very existence as the freest and strongest nation in the world today.

From time to time, this freedom has been challenged, and history shows that it has

always emerged from the test stronger and more clearly defined. But I believe that it is fair to say that it has never faced as broad, relentless and determined a challenge as it faces today from this Administration. And I am deeply troubled over the outcome—as I believe you and the American people should be.

I am not only concerned about recent public confrontations such as the attempt to withhold vital information from Congress about EPA's implementation of the toxic waste program or the earlier effort to hide documents pertaining to the enforcement of the Mineral Lands Leasing Act.

The excessive and specious claim of "Executive Privilege," coupled with the even more extraordinary excuse for withholding the so-called "enforcement-sensitive" documents used by this Administration, are matters which have caused major and wholly unnecessary Constitutional confrontations between the Congress and the Executive Branch. The public has understood these matters well. There has been extensive public discussion. And the information was produced.

What concerns me here tonight is a far more pernicious and insidious assault on our basic access to information, an assault which is taking place on many fronts. Some of the cases involve major issues, and have been widely reported in the press, some have escaped notice, some may even appear to be relatively minor when considered alone. But I suggest to you that it is not the significance of the individual case that should concern us, but rather the ominous picture they present when considered in the whole.

This Administration has launched a major campaign to repeal de facto the Freedom of Information Act.

This Administration, by revising the Executive Order on Security Classification, has increased the number of government documents that will be classified.

This Administration has prevented people with opinions it finds repugnant from entering the United States to speak to or to hear from our citizens.

This Administration has, in the name of "leak prevention," walled off officials from the press. The President's Assistant for Communications collects the telephone logs of top White House officials each week to see if anyone has talked with any member of the press.

The Administration tried to gut a host of regulations and information requirements through the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, a nongovernmental, unaccountable group of businessmen. When this effort came to naught, we saw the Administration propose its Regulatory Reform Act, which was one of the most chilling pieces of legislation I've seen in Congress. Fortunately, we were able to block its passage late last year.

The Administration has, through Executive Order 12291, attempted to circumvent the Administrative Procedure Act in order to relieve business of regulations designed to protect the health and safety of the American people.

It required a subpoena to OMB Director Stockman before documents were supplied to my Subcommittee which evidence OMB's mischief in the name of "regulatory reform."

In March of 1982, the Administration refused to send witnesses to testify on its latest secrecy proposals before the Subcommittee on Government Information and

Individual Rights, the Subcommittee which authored the Freedom of Information Act.

In June of 1982, Murray Weidenbaum refused to provide the Congress with "unpublished working papers" of the Council of Economic Advisors.

In November of 1982, the Attorney General refused to provide information to the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee on the President's Private Sector Survey on Cost Control, which purported to be studying management practices of the Federal Government.

In December of last year, the new Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisors refused to testify before the Joint Economic Committee, citing the pressures of work as an excuse, even though it was observed that Feldstein had made several appearances in public and on television in previous days.

In April of 1982, the late good friend of First Amendment freedoms, Ben Rosenthal, labeled as "ludicrous" the Administration's refusal to provide CIA information on Arab investments in the United States, even though similar information is routinely available through private institutions such as banks.

In April of 1982, the head of the General Accounting Office had to threaten to sue the Drug Enforcement Administration for withholding information from the GAO.

In April of 1982, the Administration announced plans to dismiss a Pentagon official who revealed that the President's arms build-up would cost \$750 million more than expected, and Frank Carlucci ordered lie detector tests for those in the know.

In October of 1982, the Administration got embroiled in a battle royal with the United States District Court in a case it ultimately lost, over the refusal by the Administration to provide relevant documents to the court. The Judge was sufficiently concerned to threaten to hold Justice Department employees in contempt of court.

In May of 1982, the Navy was reported as putting a "secret" stamp on an unpublished report indicating that two American aircraft carriers might not have "survived" a simulated Soviet submarine and surface ship attack.

In the spring of 1982, David Stockman revised a 30-year-old OMB Circular, known as A-10, to instruct Federal employees to "refrain from providing plans [to the Congress] for the use of appropriations that exceed the President's request."

Last Friday, Circular A-122 was withdrawn after offending the broadest group of non-profit organizations and trade associations I have ever seen in league together. It was proposed to prevent any organization receiving any Federal funds from informing the Congress of its views on legislation—even if the cost of making those views known was paid for with non-government money.

Also on Friday, there was an even more alarming abridgment of basic freedoms: the President's order tightening procedures for handling classified information and requiring lie-detector tests for a large number of government employees.

Another form of information withholding has taken the form of not gathering the information in the first place or gathering and disseminating it in some new form to prevent embarrassing historical comparisons. Many publications have been discontinued; the Census Bureau (which performs a Constitutional function) has undergone severe budget and personnel cuts; the Energy Department's Energy Information

Administration has been put to a slow death, despite the great contribution it has made to providing an independent assessment of what is really happening in our energy industries; and the Commerce Department stopped providing "net business formations" data as a part of the 12 leading indicators in the composite index—even at a time when there were historic levels of bankruptcies.

During this Administration's first two years there has been politicization of the highest levels of all executive departments, and the President has kept many of our most dedicated and competent civil servants from working with Congress and doing their jobs. I might say here that the chilling conditions that were placed on EPA employees has required my Subcommittee to subpoena and interview more than 40 employees in executive session—merely to enable them to testify freely and without intimidation. The law, in case the President and his Attorney General are unaware of it, is clear:

The right of employees, individually or collectively, to petition Congress or a Member of Congress, or to furnish information to either House of Congress, or to a committee or Member thereof, may not be interfered with or denied. (5 U.S.C. 7211).

James Madison and the Founding Fathers envisioned the First Amendment rights as basic to the functioning of the open and democratic society established by our Constitution. They cast the free press in the vital role of defending and protecting these rights. As journalists, your responsibility—and your challenge—is to make the public aware of the insidious assault on its right to know the activities of its government and its right to the fullest and freest dissemination and exchange of ideas—however unpopular they may be with the person in The White House at the time. For if our citizens are fully informed of this assault, the public outcry will surely be felt in the highest levels of our government, just as it was during the Watergate era.

That great contemporary of Madison, Thomas Jefferson said it best:

The basis of our government being the opinion of the people, the very first object should be to keep that right; and were it left to me to decide whether we should have a government without newspapers, or newspapers without a government, I should not hesitate a moment to prefer the latter.

Thank you very much for this opportunity.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 16, 1983]
ONLY SOME LEAKS BUG PRESIDENTS

(By David S. Broder)

Nothing better illustrates the surrealistic, cracked-mirror character of government secrecy edicts than a pair of actions by President Reagan last week.

The president signed an executive order on Friday requiring all federal employees with security clearances—a number reaching into the hundreds of thousands—to submit to lie-detector tests in any investigation of leaked information, or suffer "adverse consequences" for refusing. On the very same day, he stonewalled a press conference question about leaks from his own senior staff that undermined the position of Environmental Protection Agency head Anne M. Burford in the days before her resignation. "I don't know of anything of that kind," Reagan said.

As an example of high comedy, you could hardly improve on that script.

Every reporter in town knows that Reagan did not have to walk more than 50 feet from the Oval Office to find people in his employ who were leaking like crazy that Burford would have to go. "I know that you were all citing these unnamed White House sources that thought she would resign," he told reporters. "I still would like to find them out and identify them."

But he has not. Instead, he has issued the most sweeping secrecy edict in the history of the civil service. The seemingly misplaced emphasis reveals what no government—at least as long as I have worked in Washington—has ever wanted to acknowledge: what bugs a president is not leaks, but leaks from people who may disagree with him.

Time after time, in administration after administration, colleagues and I have sat in the office of some senior official who, promised anonymity, has divulged the substance of, or even read from, highly classified documents. The purpose, in almost every case, was to advance the President's policy line—in Vietnam, in some international negotiation, in some domestic political fight.

No, it's not the leaks that infuriate them. It's the leaks they don't control: the logs of private meetings with interested parties in regulatory matters, or evaluations of weapons systems that cast doubt on a multi-billion-dollar boondoggle. Those leaks, they say, are dangerous.

So be aware, dear reader, of what is really going to happen if Reagan is allowed to tie a lie-detector threat to the tail of every career official of any standing. It will not stop the leaks. The President or his people will no more play the rules of the executive order than the Reagan aides obeyed his supposedly serious order to stand by the embattled Burford. What the executive order will do is shut down your access to information that may contradict or cause you to question the policy judgments of the president and his aides.

It will increase substantially the risks for anyone—bureaucrat or journalist—who wants you to hear the other side of the policy argument from the one the president is peddling. And, while it lasts, it will increase the odds that the policy adopted will be worse than it would have been had the rules of debate—or leaking—been applied evenhandedly to friends and foes of the President's policy. ●

AGENT ORANGE TREATMENT

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the efforts of the McDonagh Medical Center in Kansas City, Mo., where a special treatment program is offered free of charge to Vietnam veterans suffering from the effects of exposure to agent orange. It is refreshing to see efforts like this in the private sector and I commend the doctors and personnel at the center for their fine work on behalf of our Nation's veterans. Following is a letter I received from the center and a press release describing the method of treatment:

McDONAGH MEDICAL CENTER, INC.,
Kansas City, Mo., January 21, 1983.
Hon. THOMAS DASCHLE,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: As Chairman of the Vietnam Veterans in Congress, you may be interested in a special treatment program being offered by our medical center to any serviceman who feels he was exposed to "Agent Orange." It is offered at no charge to the veteran, no charge to the VA, nor the government.

The treatments are being given as a public service by the doctors at McDonagh Medical Center, and results have been tremendous.

Some 19 Vietnam veterans, suffering various symptoms, have undergone this treatment since its start two years ago. Most have been from the Kansas City area, but one man recently came from New York City when he heard of the program, and stayed with us for two months. We are happy to say he is back in New York, and back to work.

Another man, a 35-year-old Kansas Citian, for 10 years was too ill to work a full days work, until his treatments at McDonagh Medical Center.

The doctors at McDonagh use an intravenous treatment that appears to arrest and, they feel, reverse the effects of the toxic defoliant, "Agent Orange."

To further explain the treatment program, I am including a copy of a press release issued on the project.

As you were instrumental in obtaining more immediate, indepth research studies as to whether servicemen in Vietnam actually were harmed by the toxic defoliant, I felt our work could be important to you.

You understand, of course, that we are proceeding on the premise that those Vietnam veterans who come to us are suffering true ailments, and we are treating those ailments now—not waiting until it has been proven, one way or the other, whether "Agent Orange" is responsible for those ailments.

We invite you, and any members of your committee, to visit with our doctors and the veterans undergoing treatment, either in person or by telephone conference, to review our procedures and learn of the heartwarming results.

Please feel free to contact either myself or the McDonagh Medical Center administrator, William D. Johnson, concerning this matter.

Very truly yours,

MARILYN MORRIS,
Public Relations Director.

KANSAS CITY VIETNAM VETERAN SUFFERING "AGENT ORANGE" POISONING SHOWS MARKED IMPROVEMENT FOLLOWING TREATMENT WITH "CHELATION" THERAPY

KANSAS CITY.—William L. Kinkade, II, a 33-year old Kansas City man who was exposed to "Agent Orange" in Vietnam ten years ago is currently undergoing special Chelation therapy that is now being offered free of charge to "Agent Orange" victims by McDonagh Medical Center, Gladstone, Missouri.

"Agent Orange" is a chemical defoliant used by the U.S. Government in Vietnam to destroy enemy cover in the jungle areas. It was an extremely effective defoliant. Unfortunately, our own servicemen, as well as the Vietnamese, suffered its effects. Reported symptoms to contact with "Agent Orange" include nerve damage, skin rashes, loss of sensation in the extremities, gastric ulcers, kidney pain, depression, memory and con-

centration disturbances, cancers of the liver, kidney, and lungs, and a long list of reported birth defects in children.

For Bill Kinkade, a U.S. Army Infantryman, it resulted in severe kidney damage. For ten years he was so fatigued that he often could not work a full days work, having to take to his bed by mid-day to rest and regain his strength.

Now, following "Chelation" therapy he shows marked improvement and can put in a 40 hour work week. He also has gone from 119 pounds to 150 pounds, the weight he held when he left for Vietnam ten years ago.

Although law suits have been brought against the five chemical companies that manufacture "Agent Orange" (including Monsanto and Dow Chemical) the companies contend there is no medical or scientific evidence to link "Agent Orange" with any adverse health effects. The chemical companies now have sued the U.S. Government.

Veteran groups say that U.S. Government medical officials contend there is no specific treatment (for those suffering from "Agent Orange")—nor any routine tests available to determine if someone has been exposed to the defoliant.

The controversy continues. Meanwhile, a Kansas City medical group, McDonagh Medical Center, 2800-A Kendallwood Parkway, in Gladstone, is offering to treat any and all Vietnam veterans exposed to "Agent Orange" with EDTA Chelation therapy, free of charge. The Chelation therapy involves an intravenous feeding of a synthetic amino acid EDTA (disodium edate) coupled with vitamin C and other vitamins and minerals. The EDTA attracts the foreign particles (in this case the "Agent Orange") and binds it. Both are then harmlessly flushed through the body.

Chelation therapy has been used successfully at McDonagh for the past twenty years for the treatment of degenerative diseases, such as hardening of the arteries, arthritis, gangrenous limbs, senility, high blood cholesterol, high blood pressure and some instances of ulcers and kidney stones.●

COMMENTS BY REPRESENTATIVE AU COIN

HON. GILLIS W. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, testimony was heard by the Rules Committee on the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1983. The controversy over wilderness has been both long and deep. Recent court decisions and the possibility of renewed Forest Service studies could extend the debate even longer. The situation clearly calls out for a legislative solution.

The House failed to pass this bill under the suspense calendar by only 12 votes last year. I believe that the comments presented to the committee by Mr. AuCoin show why the bill should receive favorable action this year. I commend the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. AuCoin, for his work on this issue, and commend to my colleagues in the House his recent remarks on the Oregon wilderness bill.

Mr. Chairman, it's a pleasure to appear before your committee today and present my views on the Oregon Wilderness Act. This piece of legislation, of which I am a co-sponsor, resolves the decade long debate over wilderness in the State of Oregon.

You may recall that during last December's lame-duck session, the House considered the Oregon Wilderness bill. The House expressed itself positively and overwhelmingly—247 to 141—on the Oregon Wilderness Act but, because of narrow, partisan bickering, we fell a few votes short of the two-thirds required under suspension of the rules. The result was that an issue that could have been resolved was left unresolved and in Oregon, it left in limbo the fate of 3 million roadless acres, some of which ought to be designated wilderness because of their critical nature and extraordinary beauty, and most of which should be returned to commercial and multiple use.

Over the last three months, the necessity to act has gone from crucial to imperative. In the worst of all possibilities, Assistant Secretary of Agriculture John Crowell recently responded to the impasse by ordering the Forest Service to re-evaluate 29 million acres of roadless areas. According to the Forest Service this re-study may take another two years and cost another \$30 million. In effect, this would be RARE III, following RARE I and RARE II which together have taken over ten years and cost millions of dollars. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that Oregon's economy simply cannot cope with this additional delay and uncertainty.

Mr. Chairman, let me put it simply. What we have are two sides—wilderness advocates and those allied with the timber industry—who have been locked in a divisive controversy for over 10 years. Neither side has the political power to legislate its own will over the other. Each side has a political veto over the other. So if there is no give in their positions millions of acres of productive lands will be held hostage. Nothing will be done. Both will lose.

And that's the way it will stay, Mr. Chairman, unless responsible Members of Congress strike a compromise which in a balanced way designates critical areas for wilderness and releases the rest for commercial and multiple use. This bill does that.

When the Ninth Circuit decided in favor of the State of California and against the Forest Service, it quickly became apparent that there were three options available to solve the crisis. One was: the Forest Service could appeal the decision of the Ninth Circuit to the Supreme Court. Well, the January 22nd deadline for appellate action came and went without action as we all knew it would. Clearly, that was no real option.

The second option was passage of the Oregon Wilderness Act of 1982. For want of 12 votes, that bill would have cleared the House three months ago and, in my estimate, would have been law by now.

But because our efforts were sidetracked in December, the third and worst possible option will be exercised by the Administration unless we do something about it. Under this option, the Forest Service will carry out its roadless area re-evaluation as part of the land and resource management plans now being developed for each of the 120 national forest units. In Oregon, that means that 2.7 million acres out of 3 million roadless acres, will be studied.

In exercising this option, Assistant Secretary Crowell goes one further step. He said, and I quote from the press release prepared

by the Forest Service: current "activities in the roadless areas will continue under existing plans so as to meet program commitments and to assure that jobs dependent on those commitments will continue." Mr. Chairman, I'm no lawyer, but this seems to fly in the face of the Ninth Circuit's decision. It is an open invitation to file suit—one which I fervently hope will not be accepted, but which none of us has any control over.

In combination, the decisions of the Ninth Circuit and the Forest Service are a disaster for the Oregon economy which is based on the forest products industry.

Oregon simply can't afford RARE III and we can't afford law suits. Oregon can't afford 3 million acres tied up by the courts or by bureaucrats. We cannot allow 400 million board feet of timber to be locked up nor can we leave vulnerable to legal challenge over 310,000 acres of oil, gas and geothermal leases.

There was only one reasonable solution last December and Mr. Chairman, there is only one solution today.

Congress must enact an Oregon wilderness bill with adequate release language.

The bill before you today is the result of nearly two years of tough negotiations within the Oregon delegation—it is a compromise which will prevent the lock up of 3 million acres of Oregon's forest lands. It is nearly identical to the bill considered last December and re-introduced last month by myself and my colleagues, Mr. Wyden and Mr. Weaver.

The Oregon Wilderness Act designates approximately 1.2 million acres for wilderness and frees, through the use of release and sufficiency language, two million acres for commercial and multiple use. Mr. Chairman, the Forest Service manages 15 million acres in the State of Oregon. If our bill prevails, there will be a total of two million acres of wilderness and 13 million acres devoted to commercial or multiple use. That splits the last 3 million roadless acres 2 to 1 in favor of commercial and multiple use. No honest person can say that those ratios are in any way balanced against jobs.

In fact, if we do not act to break this deadlock, if we let the courts continue to manage our national forests or if we allow the Forest Service to engage in another round of pencil pushing, between 5,600 and 6,400 jobs will be adversely affected, according to the Forest Service's own estimates.

This bill, then, is the only answer. That there will be additional wilderness designation in Oregon is a certainty. How much is the only question. Responsible members of the Oregon delegation and the Congress will make that decision.

I particularly want to commend my colleagues Congressman Weaver, Congressman Wyden and Senator Hatfield for their perseverance and Senator Packwood and Congressman Bob Smith for their interest in this matter.

I want to make particular note of Senator Hatfield's keen interest in this issue—one that he has taken the lead on, in the Senate. He has made it clear that he wants to move quickly on this problem.

He believes, as I do, that the controversy over RARE II has gone on longer than necessary and that the issue must be resolved.

Clearly, the ranking member of the Oregon delegation, a Republican, is eager to receive a bill from the House. I say we grab the opportunity that we now have, send this bill to the Senate, work out whatever differences we may have and send it to the President.

Let me address the question of hearings and process for just a moment. There are some who have spent the last two years on the sidelines taking political pot shots instead of working to find a solution. Reasonable and responsible people can have, and ought to have, honest disagreements over the scope of any wilderness proposal. But it is frankly beyond my comprehension, Mr. Chairman, that when a problem needs to be solved, that some would suggest that nothing be done. None of us were sent here to run away from the tough issues facing us. Oregonians may disagree over particulars, but at the very least they expect a solution and at the very least that is what they deserve.

Mr. Chairman, let me state again: To not act, or to obstruct, will cost at least 6,400 jobs and the certainty Oregon needs for future timber supply.

To not protect some of the last, few acres of pristine wild lands in Oregon would be irresponsible.

To not act or to obstruct turns over management of our forest lands to the courts or, just as bad, locks them up in the hands of planners and the pencil pushers with no guarantee that the courts won't ultimately bring us right back to the point we're at today.

Mr. Chairman, we very nearly succeeded in ending this dispute last December. We simply cannot fail again. I strongly urge you to grant a rule for this important piece of legislation. Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before your committee. ●

A NATIONAL ROLE NEEDED TO HELP VICTIMS OF DOMESTIC VIOLENCE

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on January 5 of this year I reintroduced legislation I have authored in prior years to address a growing national problem which demands a comprehensive, coordinated, and national solution—the problem of physical abuse and neglect of family members of all ages.

The problem of domestic violence is not a new one. It has been a part of society for a number of years, yet has remained oftentimes hidden from view, or more problematically, an issue which is considered unsuitable for discussion because it involves interfamily relationships. Family violence and all its unpleasant aspects is not uncommon to me as I witnessed it on countless occasions during my 23-year career with the New York City Police Department. My experience with household violence as a police officer prompted me to introduce, as one of my first acts upon coming to Congress in 1970, legislation to prevent and treat victims of child abuse. I am proud to have been one of the original authors of the landmark 1974 Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act.

Laudibly, while we have identified the problem of child abuse and have adopted a Federal response to address

it, we have allowed domestic violence—between spouses and other family members, including the elderly—to continue unabated. In 1978 hearings before the Science and Technology Committee examining research into violent behavior, the then-head of the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect noted:

Ultimately, though, we must develop an approach to the prevention of domestic violence which lowers the level of aggression and violence against all family members before family life deteriorates to unremediable breakdown beyond the reach of any number of social agencies. Unfortunately, in many communities, the unresponsiveness of community human service agencies towards . . . victims . . . seems as great as it used to be toward the victim of child abuse.

The need for a solution to the problem of domestic violence is even more pressing if one considers a survey conducted by the University of New Hampshire revealed some startling facts about domestic violence:

In the survey year, 1976, one out of every six couples had a violent "incident" which was defined as any act which caused physical pain or injury to husband or wife; and one incident out of every 100 had gone beyond this abuse to having been beaten up; almost 4 percent had used a knife or gun;

Nearly two million wives are beaten by their husbands each year, one-third of the couples experience this violence five or more times per year, with a sizable number just about every week.

A 1978 survey of police records presented at the same hearings demonstrated that husbands are often the victims of domestic violence and that husband-wife homicides comprise the single, largest category of homicide.

Another national study in 1978 of victims found that wives committed an average of 10 acts of violence against husbands. The results of this study also indicate that in a 1-year period, husbands averaged 8.8 acts of violence against their wives. In sum, the problem transcends the traditional perception that women are always victims.

The problem of domestic violence does not end with the spouses. The most recent documented form of such violence is the battered elderly parent. In hearings conducted by my Subcommittee on Human Services of the House Select Committee on Aging in 1979, it was revealed that the typical victim of elder abuse was a frail, 75-year old woman. Further, 84 percent of the abusers were relatives and 75 percent of the victims lived with their abusers. As many as 500,000 acts of violence were estimated to occur that year. A primary cause of this abuse was the additional economic stress placed upon families, which is particularly disturbing as the cost of caring for an elderly relative has skyrocketed. These extra costs place a burden on the family budget and create tension in the home which is often translated

into acts of violence against the elderly family member.

A 1981 report released by our committee contained a survey of 22 police chiefs from major metropolitan areas, representing 27 million citizens. Their responses produced the following:

Sixty-four percent said their officers had encountered situations where family neglect or physical abuse of an elderly relative had occurred;

Nearly one-third of the chiefs indicated that this type of abuse occurs frequently within their jurisdictions;

Another 50 percent of the chiefs said they had encountered situations where family members had financially abused their loved ones.

In sum, it appears that domestic violence against the elderly can be classified by physical, psychological, and material (financial) abuse as well as violation of rights through forced placement in nursing homes.

The entire problem of domestic violence has been exacerbated by the fact that it by and large, remains a hidden societal problem, despite its epidemic proportions. The need for a Federal role in this area is critical if we are to supplement what few efforts are underway at the State and local levels. It should be pointed out that the primary funding source for existing programs to assist victims is the social services block grant—formerly title XX—which has been slashed by one-quarter in the past 2 years. As social service, prevention, and treatment programs are often given low priority by States, when budget cuts arrive, these small programs are often the first to go. At the same time, recent reports indicate growing cases of reported child abuse that are directly related to increased levels of unemployment. As the causal link between all forms of family violence has been well documented, it is a fair statement to make that other domestic violence is on the rise with increased cases of reported child abuse.

This bill, H.R. 73, provides help to the estimated 2 million victims of domestic violence by authorizing a total of \$65 million over the next 3 years, in the form of grant assistance to States, localities or organizations in order to assist in the prevention and treatment of domestic violence. The emphasis here is upon fiscal restraint, with the intent of providing seed money to encourage efforts by States. It has been our experience that local groups and shelters are best equipped to administer these funds, according to their individual needs. It also encourages grantee to seek financial self-sufficiency by looking to State, local, and private sources of funding. Finally, the bill provides for termination of the program within 3 years as further encouragement to shelters to establish self-sufficiency.

Title II of H.R. 73 provides for a first-time national study of the inci-

dence of elder abuse. This will allow us to more accurately determine the extent of this particular aspect of domestic violence so that funds may be distributed accordingly. While the Administration on Aging as well as the National Institutes of Health have sponsored elder abuse research in the past, there has not, to date, been a coordinated effort which both addresses the extent of the problem as well as offers models for prevention and treatment through existing service agencies.

As in previous years, this legislation has been endorsed by a variety of agencies and organizations ranging from the International Association of Police Chiefs to the American Bar Association to the National Council of Churches. We can no longer afford to wait to find solutions to this problem and the spectre of battered families continues to rise at a time of Federal, State, and local economic retrenchment. Experience shows us that domestic violence cuts across all income groups, at all levels of society.●

LETTER FROM THE NATIONAL COALITION TO EXPAND CHARITABLE GIVING

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I have received the following letter from the National Coalition To Expand Charitable Giving, an organization made up of groups which are likely to be excluded from the Combined Federal Campaign in the future. The campaign is supposed to permit Federal employees to utilize the convenience of payroll deduction to give to the voluntary organizations of their choice. I don't see how this purpose can be met if the President issues rules excluding various types of organizations.

The letter follows:

THE NATIONAL COALITION TO
EXPAND CHARITABLE GIVING,
Washington, D.C.

Memorandum To Congresswoman PATRICIA SCHROEDER.

From Olga Corey, Coalition Coordinator.

In the city of Denver, Federal and armed services personnel give more than one million dollars each year to charitable organizations through the Combined Federal Campaign: only 15 cities in the United States make this large a contribution.

This year, however, if Presidential Order 12404 is allowed to stand, Federal employees in your District will be severely restricted in their giving choices.

The new Order, issued last month, proposes drastic changes in the CFC eligibility rules: hardest hit are groups working to protect women, children and minorities.

The poor and the powerless have already been hardest hit by Federal budget cuts:

The President says he hopes that private charity can fill the gap.

But non-profit organizations that could help fill the gap will suffer a \$33 billion loss in Federal revenue by 1985.

And now the President is making it impossible for millions of Federal and armed service employees to help some of the very groups that have been hardest hit by the recession.

The Combined Federal Campaign raises approximately \$100 million a year. Last year, when the choice of recipient organizations was greatest, official figures of the Office of Personnel Management indicate that the amount contributed increased by 7.5 percent—the first time since 1977 that the increase in giving exceeded the rate of inflation.

The National Coalition to Expand Charitable Giving consists of 25 civil rights, environmental, labor, veteran and women's organizations, organized to fight this new assault on the poor and the powerless.

We will be calling on you for your support. We hope you will help us.●

A TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR JOSEPH MARJANCZYK

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, on March 13 the parishioners of St. Adalbert's Church in Elizabeth, N.J., gathered to pay tribute to the Reverend Monsignor Joseph Marjanczyk, who for the past several years has served as pastor of the church. The occasion was to mark the end of his remarkable service at St. Adalbert's and the beginning of his new assignment as spiritual leader of Our Lady of Mount Carmel Church in Bayonne, N.J.

During his service at St. Adalbert's, Monsignor Marjanczyk won the respect of the entire community. His spiritual leadership and administration of the affairs of the parish were outstanding. He certainly will be long remembered for the strong parish council and church organizations that were developed under his guidance. His daily contributions to the spiritual life of the citizens of the area are deeply appreciated and will always serve to remind us that we are all much happier, much stronger, and more spiritually alive because he was here among us.

The Monsignor encouraged his priests and parishioners to take on responsibility. They did, responding with enthusiasm and determination, and he leaves St. Adalbert's content in the knowledge that they are devoted to continuing the many worthwhile projects he introduced. I am sure Monsignor Marjanczyk will be missed by the other priests, the nuns, and all of those who have worked so hard for the success of these projects.

Unfortunately, one of the drawbacks of success is that talented administrators and spiritual leaders are drafted to help in other places, too. Especially these days when the Polish Catholic hierarchy has such an important role to play. I say that because their views take on special significance as a result of their cultural heritage and Polish kinship with Pope John Paul. Monsignor Marjanczyk's own experience in meeting with the Holy Father and serving as Archbishop Peter Gerety's translator on a visit with the Pope made his parishioners feel even closer to the Pope.

There is no question but that Monsignor Marjanczyk has done a great job for the people of St. Adalbert's, and the parishioners of Our Lady of Mount Carmel are fortunate to be getting a pastor with his experience and administrative abilities. He has been a good shepherd, and I am delighted to join in wishing the monsignor the best of everything as he assumes his new duties.

I do not have to remind anyone about Monsignor Marjanczyk's spiritual leadership and his administration of the affairs of this parish.

They have been outstanding.

Monsignor Marjanczyk has built a strong parish council and church organizations.

I am sure Monsignor Marjanczyk will be missed by the other priests, the nuns and all to those who have worked so hard for the success of his programs at St. Adalbert's.

The Monsignor has encouraged his priest and parishioners to take on responsibility.

And he will leave St. Adalbert's confident that they are able to continue the many worthwhile programs that he developed.

Unfortunately, one of the drawbacks of success is that talented administrators and spiritual leaders are drafted to help in other places, too.

And especially these days, when the Polish Catholic hierarchy has such an important role to play.

I say that because their views take on special significance as a result of their cultural heritage and Polish kinship with Pope John Paul.

Monsignor Marjanczyk's own experience in meeting the Holy Father and serving as Archbishop Gerety's translator on a visit with the Pope makes us feel even closer to the Pope.

We see him through your eyes, Monsignor, and that view of the Holy Father is one of great moral courage.

All of us were very concerned about the Pope's safety on his trip through Central America.

And Monsignor Marjanczyk and the parishioners of St. Adalbert's are also concerned for the people in Poland.

Monsignor, you've been a great inspiration for all of us.

I wish you much success and spiritual satisfaction in your assignment at Our Lady of Mount Carmel.

You've done a great job for the people of St. Adalbert's, and the parishioners at Our Lady of Mount Carmel are fortunate to be getting a pastor with your experience and administrative abilities.

Thank you, and the best of everything in your new assignment.●

COMMEMORATING LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 17, 1983

● Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, February 16 is both a joyous and a sorrowful day for Lithuanians, Americans of Lithuanian descent, and for all those who champion the cause of freedom worldwide. On this date in 1918, the Lithuanian people freed themselves from the shackles of foreign domination and proclaimed Lithuania to be an independent republic, a nation-state that was recognized by the entire free world.

Sadly, the life of this independent state proved to be a short one. On June 15, 1940, the Soviet Union broke all treaties with the Republic of Lithuania, occupying and illegally annexing it. Its people have remained under the domination of Russian communism ever since.

All who cherish liberty should pause to commemorate Lithuania's Independence Day. We should give thanks for the few short years Lithuanians could bask in the warm light of freedom, but at the same time pray for a valiant country that has endured the cold darkness of Communist tyranny for so long a time.●

THE PLIGHT OF HUNGARIANS IN RUMANIA

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, of late, many of my colleagues have taken the opportunity to express their concern for the plight of oppressed ethnic groups from around the world.

I regret that it is necessary to recognize yet another group—the Hungarians of Rumania. These people have suffered an organized repression of their cultural heritage of great magnitude. It is with the plight of these people in mind, and with the hope that public awareness will result in change, that I wish to share the following resolution:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT THE THIRD WORLD CONGRESS OF THE FREE WORLD HUNGARIANS ON SEPTEMBER 19, 1982, IN TORONTO

PREAMBLE

The Transylvanian Steering Committee of the Third World Congress, in its sessions on September seventeen and eighteen, discussed the situation of the oppressed Hungarians in Rumania, the measures of the Ceausescu regime, detrimental to the Hungarians, steps taken in defense of these Hungarians and to be taken in the future.

Due to the facts that:

(a) the annexation of Transylvania and other Hungarian territories to Rumania did not solve the minority problem there, on the contrary, it aggravated it,

(b) the peace treaties of Trianon (1920) and Paris (1947) delivered the Hungarians, the original inhabitants of Transylvania, into the hands of the ruling Rumanians, without an adequate guarantee to safeguard the human and national rights of the Hungarians,

(c) the Hungarians in Rumania are doomed to cultural and national annihilation due to the oppressive policies of the Ceausescu regime aimed toward them,

(d) and because the government of the Hungarian People's Republic does nothing to protect the human and national rights of the oppressed Hungarians in Transylvania and other parts of Rumania,

the Third World Congress of the Free World Hungarians came to the following conclusion:

(A) under Rumanian rule the existence and the survival of the Hungarian indigenous population is further imperilled.

(B) as soon as the potentialities present themselves, due to the change in the course of history, a political and territorial rearrangements should be instituted in the Carpathian Basin and the adjoining territories in which Hungarians, Czechs, Croats, Germans, Rumanians, Ruthenes, Slovaks, Slovenes, Serbs and other nationalities living in that region would have equal rights

To develop their national cultures undisturbed,

To use their respective native languages freely and

To utilize their national life potential to its fullest.

Because the peace treaty of Trianon as well as the oppressive policies of the Rumanian Socialist Republic towards the national minorities stand in the way to such enlightened and just reorganization, which would respect the interests and rights of all nationalities concerned, the Third World Congress of the Free World Hungarians passed the following resolution:

RESOLUTION

1. The explanatory work with regard to the grave mistakes of the Peace Treaty of Trianon in unjustly dealing a heavy blow to the Hungarian nation and upsetting the European balance of power with disastrous consequences, shall be pursued with increased effort by intellectual means.

2. The intellectual and political struggle, in order to realize in effect the human and national rights of the Hungarians living in Transylvania and other parts of Rumania, shall be continued with increased vigor with the following main objectives in mind:

(a) Every studying Hungarian child and young man/girl from kindergarten on, through primary and secondary schools to universities and other institutions of higher learning, shall receive his or her education in the Hungarian language and in the spirit

of Hungarian tradition. All discriminatory quotas shall be eliminated. The training of the necessary teachers shall be assured.

(b) In the entire territory of Transylvania the Hungarian language shall be recognized by legislation and in practice as official language co-equal with the Rumanian language.

(c) The Hungarians in Rumania, as a group with separate ethnic and national entity, shall enjoy equal rights and status with the Rumanians in political, cultural, educational affairs, also in matters pertaining to economy and religion, in every sphere of life, guaranteed by legislation and enforced.

(d) The Hungarian University in Kolozsvár (Cluj) and other discontinued, reduced or Rumanianized Hungarian institutes of higher learning, including seminaries and theological colleges as well as Hungarian schools at every educational level, shall be restored as independent Hungarian educational units. The confiscated Hungarian cultural treasures, archives, registers and cultural institutions shall be returned to the Hungarians.

3. The Third World Congress of the Free World Hungarians calls upon the Hungarians living in the United States and urges them to contact their congressmen and senators individually and personally thereby becoming more active in American politics in order to champion the cause of the Hungarians in Rumania.

The World Congress considers, the increased activities of the Hungarians living in the free world of utmost importance, therefore asks them to utilize the press and every other cultural, educational and political means available in order to strive effectively towards informing the concerned governments of the tragic fate of Hungarians in Rumania.

The World Congress asks all Hungarian Transylvanian organizations, which are active in the same country or on the same continent, to collaborate with each other and to co-ordinate their aims, their methods and their activities for the purpose of increasing the effectiveness of their work.

Furthermore the Congress urges these organizations to hasten the dissemination of the samizdat (underground) paper, the Counterpoints (Ellenpontok), an informative publication of the Hungarians in Rumania, in the Hungarian original as well as in other languages throughout the free world.

DISTRICT HEATING AND COOLING TAX INCENTIVES ACT OF 1983

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced the District Heating and Cooling Tax Incentives Act of 1983.

District heating and cooling is a system of delivering hot or cold water or steam from a central thermal source through pipes to customers for space heating and cooling and industrial processes. DHC is a flexible energy distribution system that can obtain heat from any number of fuels

and deliver it to many different customers. The central source may be from the waste heat of an electric powerplant—cogeneration—refuse incineration, industrial processes, geothermal sources—solar, geothermal, ground water, atmosphere—or manufactured sources—industrial waste heat, and synfuels.

District heating can achieve 80-percent fuel efficiency and such systems can be cost effective in 48 States. By comparison, kinetic energy derived from an electric turbine uses only 30 percent of the energy potential of a conventional fuel burn. District heating harnesses the remaining byproduct which would otherwise be released into the atmosphere or waterways.

My legislation contains amendments to the Internal Revenue Code designed to make available to district heating and cooling property tax benefits granted by present law to many similar energy-related facilities. The bill would accomplish the following:

First, investment tax credit. District heating and cooling equipment would be made eligible for the basic 10 percent investment tax credit.

Second, additional energy credit. The bill would provide an additional 20 percent business energy credit for district heating and cooling property.

Third, accelerated cost recovery. District heating and cooling property would be made eligible for the 5-year category for depreciation that was introduced by the Economic Recovery Tax Act of 1981.

Fourth, use by local governments, et cetera. The bill would permit the investment tax credit to be taken where the property is used by or leased to a government unit. In addition, there would be no recapture of investment credit or depreciation upon sale of a district heating facility to a municipal or tax-exempt organization.

Mr. Speaker, tax incentives are needed to stimulate capital formation for district heating and cooling. Because of the enormous capital outlays required by district heating and cooling systems governmental incentives are highly desirable and perhaps essential if we are to create new district heating construction, expansion and rehabilitation. In its present form, the Federal income tax law contains no provisions specifically recognizing the concept of district heating. Existing tax treatment is quite unfavorable to district heating and cooling.

Tax incentives for district heating and cooling can balance the discrepancy between district heating and cooling and other investment opportunities by giving district heating and cooling tax incentives similar to those now enjoyed by investors in cogeneration equipment, hydroelectric generating equipment, and equipment for utilizing alternative energy sources.

This legislation will result in no revenue loss to the Treasury because of the indirect revenues generated by increased investment in manufacturing, construction and employment that will be produced by the tax incentives. The objective of the bill is to expedite and not subsidize the expansion of district heating and cooling.

We have all actively supported legislation which encourages the development of viable new sources of energy. In order for the United States to become independent, we must not only decrease our dependency upon foreign oil, but encourage the development of alternative forms of energy as well, such as synthetic fuels and solar energy.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation—for district heating is not an idea whose time has come, it is an idea whose time has been reborn.●

MELAMINE TRADE PARITY

HON. W. HENSON MOORE

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to increase the column 1 duty on imported melamine. This legislation is similar to H.R. 6030 which I introduced in the last Congress, except that instead of increasing the duty to 11 percent, it is raised to 9.2 percent, which is exactly the level being charged by the European Economic Community on melamine imported to its markets.

This action is not intended to erect a protectionist barrier or to replace the current trade imbalance with another. I am an advocate of free trade and remain one so long as the ground rules of international trade competition are the same. Rather, I seek to correct a mistake made by our own negotiators in previous trade negotiations in which the U.S. duty on melamine was placed at less than half that of the European rate, even though the product is identical and the manufacturing process is exactly the same.

This discrepancy has effectively cut off any melamine export market that domestic producers might have had. Indeed, the method of figuring the European duty, the multiplier effect of the value added tax, and a discrepancy in freight rates has combined to give the Europeans a substantial price advantage over U.S. producers.

In addition to this tariff discrepancy I have evidence that foreign producers of melamine are actively refusing any U.S. entry of melamine into their domestic market while pricing their melamine as much as three times higher in their own country than they charge in the United States to compete against our two domestic producers,

both of which are located in Louisiana.

This matter has been referred to the International Trade Commission, the U.S. Trade Representative, and the Department of Commerce, but no relief has been forthcoming. Therefore, I have found corrective legislation is necessary to insure Congress can have the opportunity to let our trading partners know that free trade should also be fair trade. ●

FUTURE CHANGES IN SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. EDWARD R. ROYBAL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. ROYBAL. Mr. Speaker, a great deal of misunderstanding has arisen in response to the proposal to reduce future social security benefits by outright changes in the benefit formula as proposed in the Senate Finance Committee, or by raising the age for full retirement benefits as in the recent legislation proposed by this House. As chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, I would like to share information which shows that either of these proposals will reduce benefits to individuals with already inadequate income and little opportunity or ability to increase it.

FUTURE BENEFIT LEVELS

Even though the annual benefit of a retired worker is, at \$4,896, almost identical to the official poverty threshold, there is a growing perception that social security benefits are too generous.

In reality, one-fourth of the elderly depend on social security for 90 percent of their income, and any general benefit cut can be expected to increase poverty and deprivation. Federal, State, and local welfare and health care costs also would expand.

Since the current social security benefit formula is designed to stabilize benefit replacement rates over time, average future benefits will remain close to the poverty figures. And although there will be some growth in pension coverage and private retirement savings, social security will remain the primary retirement income source for an overwhelming majority of older Americans—and the only income source for a great minority of 21st century retirees.

Many people believe that future beneficiaries will be treated much better than was originally intended. In truth, future benefit levels will actually be less than originally projected for the below average earner who is now and will continue to be the group most dependent on social security. Only the highest income earners will get a sig-

nificantly better return than specified in the 1939 act.

The replacement rate—ratio of initial benefit payments to the previous year's earnings—for low earners has dropped by 8.2 percent—from 57.2 percent under the original 1939 Social Security Act to 52.5 percent under present law—1977 act. For maximum earners the replacement rate has increased 20.5 percent—from 22.9 to 27.6 percent. Any across-the-board benefit reduction will push lowest income groups further behind originally intended benefit levels while even average earners move into the negative column. Higher income workers, who also suffer a cut, would still be significantly better off than intended in the 1939 act.

RAISING RETIREMENT AGE

Support for raising the retirement age is based, in part, on misunderstandings concerning the true nature of early retirement. It is commonly assumed that most early retirees withdraw from work voluntarily, in good health and in comfortable financial circumstances. However, analysis demonstrates that in most cases early retirement is involuntary and presents a significant financial hardship for the persons involved.

There is no question that overall life expectancies have improved since 1940 and will continue to improve in the future. At question, however, is whether there have or will be parallel improvements in health and the ability to work; and whether there are some specific groups who are not affected by the general trend toward longer life.

Although some workers in good health do retire voluntarily because of the availability of early retirement benefits—particularly the 28 percent of workingmen eligible for private pensions—a large proportion of early retirees do so because of poor health and despite the economic deprivation caused by retirement.

According to "Demographic and Economic Characteristics of Social Security Retiree Families," a 1982 General Accounting Office study, almost one-third—30.4 percent—of early retirees cited poor health or job loss as the single most important reason for their early retirement. Forty-three percent cited these reasons as a major factor in their decision to seek early, reduced benefits.

Dr. Jacob Feldman of the National Center for Health Statistics, points out that the downward trend in death rates for men aged 50 to 69 has been paralleled by increases in disability rates. While the rate of reported disability for men aged 60 to 64 increased 26 percent—from 15.0 to 18.9—during the 1970's, their death rate decreased over 10 percent—from 29 to 26 per 1,000. These contradictory trends demonstrate that while future health im-

provements may enable some people to live longer, they will do so with chronic and disabling health conditions which will prevent continued employment.

Dr. Robert Butler, former Director of the National Institute of Aging, told the National Commission on Social Security Reform that early retirees tend to be nonwhites and in physically demanding occupations. Minorities have poorer health and higher mortality rates than whites. In 1978, the number of deaths was nearly twice as high for black men age 55 to 64 than white men in the same age group. In addition, the percent of minority men age 55 to 64 who are unemployed is higher than white men in that age group. A study in the December 1982 Social Security Bulletin, "Mortality and Early Retirement," confirmed "that age 62 claimants were more likely to have health problems than were other insured workers," and that their survival rates were lower.

EFFECT OF SOCIAL SECURITY REDUCTIONS ON TOTAL INCOME

Although there have been a number of suggestions that reductions in basic social security benefits can be made up by increases in other income sources—such as private pensions—the facts suggest that there will be no substitute for a strong social security system.

In 1981, the President's Commission on Pension Policy concluded that the most serious problem facing our retirement income system is the lack of pension coverage among private sector employees. While it is clear that there is a need for expanded pension coverage it is difficult to venture, with any certainty, a reasonable picture of what pension coverage will be in the future.

From the beginning of World War II, the portion of the private sector work force covered by a company pension plan continually increased from 14.5 percent in 1940 to about 49 percent in 1972. Since then, the growth has leveled off, increasing only 1 percentage point—to 50 percent—by 1979. Moreover, the share of workers who participate in private pensions is expected to remain at current level through 1995, according to a forecast prepared by the Labor Department. While the number of people drawing private retirement benefits will almost double to 14 million by 1980, that will still be less than half of the expected 40 million social security retirees.

These pension coverage statistics and other demographics demonstrate that reductions in social security benefits will not be able to be made up by private sources. Reports prepared by the President's Commission on Pension Policy document that minority workers, in particular, retire earlier, are less likely to be covered by private pensions, and receive smaller benefits

from social security. These facts reflect their poorer health, earlier mortality, more chronic unemployment, and employment in nonpension covered jobs.

Similarly, women have less pension coverage and commensurately lower social security benefits. Of all workers not covered by a pension plan, almost half—47 percent—are employed in retail trade and services which are characterized by a high proportion of small, nonunionized establishments and a large percentage of female employees.

Even for those men and women who receive private pensions, social security benefits will still play the primary role in assuring retirement income security well into the 21st century. A recent study conducted by ICF for the American Council of Life Insurance entitled "Pension Coverage and Expected Retirement Benefits" concludes that social security will continue to provide more than 60 percent of all retirement income for persons eligible for both social security and private pensions—80 percent for persons with \$15,000 current earnings and 50 percent for workers above \$30,000 current earnings. Reductions, therefore, will have a significant adverse impact on all people—even for the minority of men, women and families who will also have private pensions.

EFFECT OF SHORT-TERM PROPOSALS ON LONG-RUN TRUST SOLVENCY: NO NEED FOR DRASTIC ACTION

Predicting the long-range economic status of the social security trust funds is an uncertain act even for the most professional of actuaries. The volatility of demographic factors—fertility, mortality, vitality and net immigration—is exceeded by the volatility of economic factors—productivity, employment, inflation, and fringe benefit growth. However, taking the two intermediate assumptions of the 1982 Social Security Trustees, there will continue to be severe cash flow problems in the 1980's which necessitated the legislation which was passed last week. However, even with the anticipated deficits in the 1980s and even before any new legislation, the more pessimistic of the two intermediate projections showed the social security cash benefit trust funds to be in a surplus situation over the next 25 years.

The primary reason for the financial soundness of the social security trust funds for the two decades after 1989 is demographic. Compared to the 1970's and 1980's, there will be about 17 percent fewer new retirees in the late 1990's and early 2000's when the baby bust generation of the Great Depression reaches retirement age. At the same time, the baby boomers of the late 1940's and 1950's will swell the labor force as they reach their peak earning years. Therefore, under current law projections, trust fund re-

serves, even after repaying the deficits of the 1980's, will grow from about \$26 billion in 1983 to more than \$200 billion—1983 dollars—by 2007.

The short-term refinancing proposals passed last week will increase trust fund reserves in the 1990's and early 21st century to over 1 trillion 1983 dollars—the equivalent of about 7 years' total benefit obligations and the total current debt of the United States. Under the intermediate assumptions, these short-term proposals, by themselves, guarantee sufficient long-term financing to pay benefits to all current workers. Even today's 24-year-old laborer, with a 51-year life expectancy, can be assured that the trust funds will have sufficient reserves to pay benefits from his/her initial eligibility in 2021 until his/her death in the 2030's.

Although the short-term proposals do not solve the social security financing problems of the 2040's and 2050's, it is difficult to justify making permanent and irreversible reductions in social security based on estimates of what will occur 50 or 75 years from now. This is especially true since the proposals to raise the age of full retirement and/or reduce basic benefit amounts, which will require almost immediate revisions to private pension plans, will be phased in early in the next century, when trust fund reserves will be at their highest levels in 50 years.

CURRENT ALTERNATIVE FOR LONG- AND SHORT-TERM

Several current alternatives exist for solving a portion of the long-range financial problem without unnecessarily burdening older workers who are unable to work. These proposals would alter public and private employment and retirement policies to remove employment obstacles and offer incentives for continued work. These, combined with a more moderate increase in the tax rate, could solve the long-range problem in a more equitable manner.

Recommendation No. 1: Eliminate mandatory retirement. Most of the Nation's employers use a compulsory retirement age, usually age 70, beyond which individuals are not allowed to work regardless of their physical capacity or performance level. Although the practice of mandatory retirement is gradually diminishing—a recent Aging Committee survey found that 38 percent of Fortune 500 companies had no mandatory retirement age—it is generally acknowledged that Federal legislation is necessary to eradicate this antiquated practice altogether.

Recommendation No. 2: Require fair pension treatment for older workers. It is a little known fact that about half of the Nation's employers halt increases in pension benefits at age 65. This practice, which is condoned by Federal regulations issued by the

Labor Department, serves to discourage older workers from remaining employed beyond age 65. Freezing pension benefit accruals has no cost justification, according to an actuarial analysis published by the House Aging Committee. Rather, it is a means of arbitrarily discouraging workers from remaining employed beyond age 65.

Recommendation No. 3: Offer tax incentives to employers for hiring older workers. The reluctance by employers to hire older workers can be partially overcome with economic incentives. One simple mechanism would be to amend the targeted jobs tax credit (TJTC) by adding low-income, unemployed older workers to the list of groups now included in the program. According to a Congressional Budget Office study, approximately 75,000 workers would benefit by this tax credit proposal at an estimated cost to the U.S. Treasury of \$125 million annually. Assuming that without this program all of these workers would have been drawing social security benefits and not working, the projected savings to social security from this proposal would be \$0.7 billion annually by the year 2000—\$0.5 billion in 1983 dollars. By the year 2000, alternatives such as these would provide approximately \$4.4 billion in annual savings to the social security system—\$2.1 billion in 1983 dollars—for total long-range savings to social security of 0.14 percent of taxable payroll.

Additional alternatives which merit consideration but would increase costs to the social security system should be considered when trust fund reserves permit it. Those alternatives include a liberalization of the retirement earnings test for persons over 65 and providing an exemption of social security taxes for older workers and their employers.●

BEYOND THE "SMOKING GUNS" AT THE EPA

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I have a special interest in the controversy over the management of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). My particular concern is actually not the fact that the now infamous Stringfellow Acid Pits are in my congressional district, although they were a motivating reason for my active involvement in enactment of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) of 1976, the predecessor law of the so-called Superfund legislation. Nor is this special interest related directly to my membership as the ranking member, and former chairman of, the Subcommittee on

Natural Resources, Agricultural Research and Environment of the Committee on Science and Technology, now chaired by my colleague JAMES SCHEUER. Nor is this special interest directly related to my current chairmanship of the Subcommittee on Department Operations, Research and Foreign Agriculture of the Agriculture Committee which has legislative jurisdiction over another EPA program in some trouble, the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act. No, all these are reasons for special interest, but they are incidental to my remarks today.

Mr. Speaker, my special interest simply stated is in the preservation of the environment, and in the rule of law in this land. The tendency of all of us, myself included, to focus on those areas specifically in our committee jurisdiction or located in our districts is natural, and commendable. But we must not lose sight of the broader purpose, even as we diligently pursue our particular concerns and exercise our special roles through our various committee assignments.

The fundamental problem at the EPA is not money, malice, or even mismanagement. It is, I believe, a lack of desire to faithfully execute the laws of the land, and particularly a lack of desire to live up to the spirit of those laws. This lack starts with President Reagan, and is reflected in many, if not most, of his appointees. In the case of the EPA and our environmental laws, it is easy to identify the lack of desire to execute the laws for two simple reasons. One, the laws are more specific than in many other areas, and two, there is still overwhelming public support for implementing these laws, and little inclination to give the current group of political stewards the benefit of the doubt after 2 years of apparent retreat from our environmental goals.

I believe it is important to grasp this essential point, which I believe can be documented by reviewing budgets, rules changes, and speeches by President Reagan and his appointees throughout the Government. Once we understand that our problem is not just a few misguided political appointees at EPA, it will be easier to understand what we must do, even though it will be harder to do what we must. If we fail to grasp this essential point we may find ourselves delving deeper and deeper into less and less, while the chemical wastes, toxic substances, auto emissions, and water effluents continue to poison our biosphere.

No amount of reshuffling of boxes will solve the problem of unenthusiastic administration. Independent commissions solve some regulatory problems, if they are truly independent, have adequate funds, and well-motivated administration. Usually, it takes years to create such a situation with

everyone pulling in the same direction. Some problems might actually be aggravated with an independent commission. Clearly, the systematic undermining of EPA's research branch under this administration would not be abated by such a change.

Even on the practical level of what to do about hazardous waste sites, I am not sure I see any proposals that will deal with this problem. A few years ago a Member of the other body proposed giving the hazardous waste cleanup job to the Army Corps of Engineers. While I am not prepared to endorse this proposal today, I am increasingly concerned that we appear to care more about "smoking guns" than we do about providing adequate and specific direction to the Reagan administration. In impoundment fights over the Water Pollution Control Act, the Congress took it upon itself to force executive action. I believe we are at that stage with the Superfund program. Even if no smoking guns are found, there is a very serious problem at EPA. We need to begin putting this Agency back together in a constructive way and we will be watching for the new appointees to the Agency.

Mr. Speaker, before I close, let me be a bit parochial. Since everyone has heard of the Stringfellow Acid Pits, which were supposed to get Superfund financing, but for some reason did not, I would like to make a few observations. One, the money still has not come. If the reason last year was the potential benefit to a fellow named Brown in a close election, I wonder what the reason is 4 months later? Second, even if the money which I heard would be released last October was released today, it would not be enough to pay for the total cleanup cost of the site. I have come to believe that even if there was not a scandal today, the problem would persist. And I would like to know that when the hint or fact of scandal is past, the Stringfellow Acid Pits will be cleaned up once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to use this renewed attention and commitment to our environmental laws wisely. Let us find a way to implement laws that this administration would rather repeal. This is not the most constructive way to solve national problems, but I believe it is the only practical way to approach the present mess at EPA.

A TRIBUTE TO JAMISON BEDDING, INC.

HON. ALBERT GORE, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to take this opportunity to

congratulate Jamison Bedding, Inc., of Franklin, Tenn., on the centennial anniversary of its founding for its success and endurance during our Nation's tough economic times.

For 100 years, Jamison Bedding has been a source of pride to Tennesseans for the quality workmanship of its product. Founded by Robert D. Jamison, the business has remained principally family-owned and now holds the distinction of being the largest privately owned, bedding manufacturer in the entire Nation.

What began as a small business with a single plant in Nashville, Tenn., has grown, with its dedication to hard work, into a company that now operates three plants in Franklin, Nashville, and Albany, Ga., employing more than 400 workers.

The success of Jamison Bedding is a tribute to all of our Nation's privately owned businesses that demonstrate solid management skills and maintain a personal, one-to-one relationship with each of its customers.

It is my hope that Jamison Bedding and others like it across the country will continue to prosper, offering a shining example to the business community that the free enterprise spirit that built this Nation still exists today.

THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND 1983 ST. PATRICK'S DAY MESSAGE

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of submitting the text of the Friends of Ireland's 1983 St. Patrick's Day message. This is the third annual message from the Friends of Ireland and reaffirms our strong commitment to the political process as the way forward in Northern Ireland and condemns the use of or support for violence as a solution to the problems of this country. This year's message has been joined in by 29 Members of the U.S. Senate and 50 members of the House of Representatives. I have also included a copy of the St. Patrick's Day message to the Friends of Ireland in the U.S. Congress from Mr. Tom Fitzpatrick, T.D., Ceann Comhairle (Speaker), Dail Eireann (Irish Parliament) and chairman of the Irish-United States Parliamentary Group. I commend these to my colleagues attention.

Those of us in Congress who follow Irish affairs have in recent years chosen the occasion of St. Patrick's Day to reaffirm our commitments both to help end the violence in Northern Ireland and to contribute by peaceful means to the great goal of Irish unity.

Two years ago, we founded the Friends of Ireland to provide a forum for an informed American role in assisting an overall political settlement. As Friends of Ireland, we shall continue to do all we can in the year ahead to inform the Congress and the American people about the conflict in Ireland, and to further the goal of a just and enduring peace.

It must surely be clear that any lasting political settlement in Northern Ireland can be achieved only by peaceful and constitutional means, through negotiation, compromise, and with the consent of all those involved—not by ultimatum, intimidation, or violence, which serve only to prolong the anguish of that deeply divided community and frustrate progress toward unity and political reconciliation.

On this St. Patrick's Day, therefore, we appeal again to our fellow Americans to reject those who believe in bloodshed, to renounce organizations which are the agents of violence and to deny American dollars to any group that condones or contributes to the killing. Instead, we urge our fellow citizens to be unyielding in their commitment to peaceful political change.

1982 was a year of disappointment and concern for all of us who hope for peace in Northern Ireland. Callous bombings, vicious assassinations, and reckless maimings of the innocent carried out by terrorist organizations have contributed to the atmosphere of despondency and aggravated the cycle of vengeance in a community that has already suffered too much for too long. Disturbing allegations about a recent pattern of shooting incidents by the security forces in Northern Ireland, and continued reliance by law enforcement authorities on lethal plastic bullets are cause for deep concern. Chronic unemployment, the continuing British commitment to an unworkable political proposal, and the lack of progress toward ending institutionalized discrimination in Northern Ireland have dimmed the hope of early progress in resolving economic and political problems.

At the heart of the Northern Ireland conflict lies a profound crisis of identity and allegiance. Just as the troubles will not be battered or bombed away by terrorists, so they cannot be wished away by measures that serve only to preserve the status quo. The roots of the conflict lie deep in the history of Ireland and in the record of Britain's involvement there. As such, we believe it requires the bold cooperation of both the British and the Irish Governments jointly pursuing at the highest levels a new strategy of reconciliation.

In the summit agreements of Irish and British Prime Ministers, there exists the framework for pursuit of such a strategy. We therefore would welcome—and encourage—revival of contracts between the two Governments at this level.

We are also heartened by the progress within Ireland of the debate on reconciliation. We commend the important recent decision by the Irish Government to establish a forum for consultation on the means by which peace and stability can be achieved in a new Ireland through the democratic process. We are especially encouraged by the agreement of all the political parties in the Republic of Ireland and of the Social Democratic and Labour Party in Northern Ireland to participate in this forum. And we welcome their action in seeking the views of all peoples of both traditions in Ireland, North and South, who share the objectives of this constructive new undertaking.

We hope that steps such as these will lead in the very near future to a solemn commitment by all the parties to heal the divisions within Northern Ireland and to reconcile the two major traditions that exist in Ireland.

There should also be an American dimension to this healing process. As Friends of Ireland, we have been heartened by the support we have received for our endeavors from the Irish Government and Parliament. We believe that the cause of reconciliation between the Protestant and Catholic traditions in Ireland and between Britain and Ireland is one which merits the full support and the responsible involvement of the United States.

To this end, the Friends of Ireland have sought to foster a close working relationship with the Parliament in Ireland, with the Government there, and with the main political parties of that Nation. Last year, at the invitation of the Speaker of the Irish Parliament, a delegation of the Friends of Ireland visited Ireland for meetings with party leaders and with the Government. Since then, a sister organization has been established in the Irish Parliament to advance our shared goal of greater understanding and cooperation between our two peoples. We send greetings to our friends in the Irish Parliament. We warmly welcome their message of support today, and look forward to receiving them soon in Washington.

On this St. Patrick's Day, we renew our commitment to the great goal of Irish unity, and reiterate our conviction that the only sure road to a just and lasting peace is to end the division of the Irish people. We seek a unity based on democratic principles, achieved by negotiation and persuasion, secured with consent freely given by a majority of the people of Northern Ireland and with full constitutional safeguards for the rights and traditions of all concerned.

U.S. Senate.—Edward M. Kennedy (D-Mass.); Daniel Patrick Moynihan (D-N.Y.); Christopher J. Dodd (D-Conn.); Joseph R. Biden, Jr. (D-Del.); Jeff Bingaman (D-N.Mex.); Dale Bumpers (D-Ark.); William S. Cohen (R-Maine); Alan Cranston (D-Calif.); Alan J. Dixon (D-Ill.); Pete V. Domenici (R-N.Mex.); Thomas F. Eagleton (D-Mo.); John Glenn (D-Ohio); Gary Hart (D-Colo.); John Heinz (R-Pa.); Ernest F. Hollings (D-S.C.); Daniel K. Inouye (D-Hawaii); Paul Laxalt (R-Nev.); Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.); Carl Levin (D-Mich.); Spark M. Matsunaga (D-Hawaii); Howard M. Metzenbaum (D-Ohio); Claiborne Pell (D-R.I.); William Proxmire (D-Wis.); Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (D-Mich.); Paul E. Tsongas (D-Mass.); Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (R-Conn.); Bill Bradley (D-N.J.); George J. Mitchell (D-Maine); Arlen Specter (R-Pa.).

House of Representatives.—Thomas P. O'Neill, Jr. (D-Mass.); Thomas S. Foley (D-Wash.); James M. Shannon (D-Mass.); Frank Annunzio (D-Ill.); Edward P. Boland (D-Mass.); Don Bonker (D-Wash.); Frederick C. Boucher (D-Va.); Baltasar Corrada (D-P.R.); Tom Downey (D-N.Y.); Brian J. Donnelly (D-Mass.); Richard J. Durbin (D-Ill.); Bernard J. Dwyer (D-N.J.); Roy Dyson (D-Md.); Joseph D. Early (D-Mass.); Don Edwards (D-Calif.); Edward F. Feighan (D-Ohio); Geraldine A. Ferraro (D-N.Y.); Edwin B. Forsythe (R-N.J.); Barney Frank (D-Mass.); Sam Gejdenson (D-Conn.); Dennis M. Hertel (D-Mich.); James J. Howard (D-N.J.); Barbara B. Kennelly (D-Conn.); Tom Lantos (D-Calif.); Elliott H. Levitas (D-Ga.).

Lynn Martin (R-Ill.); Frank McCloskey (D-Ind.); Joseph M. McDade (R-Pa.); Mat-

thew F. McHugh (D-N.Y.); James F. McNulty, Jr. (D-Ariz.); Edward R. Madigan (R-Ill.); Edward J. Markey (D-Mass.); Joseph G. Minish (D-N.J.); Joe Moakley (D-Mass.); Jim Moody (D-Wis.); Robert J. Mrazek (D-N.Y.); Austin Murphy (D-Pa.); Nick Rahall (D-W. Va.); Peter W. Rodino, Jr. (D-N.J.); James H. Scheuer (D-N.Y.); Pat Schroeder (D-Colo.); John F. Seiberling (D-Ohio); Lawrence J. Smith (D-Fla.); Al Swift (D-Wash.); Robert G. Torricelli (D-N.J.); Bob Traxler (D-Mich.); Tom J. Vandergriff (D-Tex.); Pat Williams (D-Mont.); Silvio O. Conte (R-Mass.); Frank Horton (R-N.Y.).

ST. PATRICK'S DAY MESSAGE TO THE FRIENDS OF IRELAND GROUP IN THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS FROM MR. TOM FITZPATRICK, T.D., CEANN COMHAIRLE (SPEAKER), DAIL EIREANN AND CHAIRMAN OF THE IRISH-UNITED STATES PARLIAMENTARY GROUP

On the occasion of St. Patrick's Day 1983, I send you from Ireland the greetings and good wishes of all the Members of the Irish-United States Parliamentary Group which we have recently established in the Houses of the Oireachtas as a counterpart to the Friends of Ireland in the United States Congress. We welcome the constructive interest you have taken in Irish affairs over the years and share with you a deep commitment to the goals of peace, reconciliation and unity in Ireland. It is our certain conviction, as it is yours, that unity can be achieved only by peaceful democratic means, through persuasion, negotiation and agreement and not by violence or intimidation.

We look forward to meeting with you, the Friends of Ireland, in Washington in the near future.●

NEW TIP REPORTING RULES

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE, Mr. Speaker, one of the most confusing, and unjustified, aspects of the so-called Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982 was the tip reporting provision. Owners and employees of restaurants in my State do not know what this act does, who it applies to, and what its ramifications are. I voted against this provision when it appeared before us last year, and I have cosponsored legislation for its repeal this year. However, it does not appear that repealing legislation will be successful before the information reporting and withholding provision begin on April 1 of this year.

Consequently, I would like to have printed in the RECORD the following analysis of these provisions, prepared by the House Ways and Means Committee. If we cannot repeal this bad provision in time, at least we have the responsibility to explain it to the people who will be burdened by it.

The analysis follows.

FACT SHEET ON NEW TIP REPORTING RULES

Do the new provisions require withholding on tip income? No. The new provisions revise the prior law rules relating to the re-

porting of tip income for information purposes, but do not impose any new income tax withholding requirements.

What are the new rules for reporting tip income, and how do these differ from prior law? Under the law prior to TEFRA and present law, any employee who receives tips in excess of \$20 a month must report all tips received to the employer on a monthly basis. Tips reported to the employer are treated as wages and as such are subject to income tax withholding and social security (FICA) tax (at the employee rate only). In addition, tipped employees must keep detailed records of tips they receive. These rules have not changed.

The new provisions added in the Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act require additional information to be reported to the I.R.S. by "large food and beverage establishments". In some cases, a "tip allocation" rule will also apply. There is no change in the law with respect to income tax withholding and FICA taxes; these taxes are still to be applied only to tip income voluntarily reported to employers by employees.

What is the "tip allocation" rule and when does it apply? If tipped employees of large food and beverage establishments voluntarily report to the employer tips aggregating 8 percent or more of the establishment's gross receipts, then no allocation rule applies. However, if tipped employees (in the aggregate) report less than 8 percent of gross receipts in tips, the employer must allocate among tipped employees the difference between 8 percent and the tips reported, and he must report these allocations to both the I.R.S. and the employees annually, for information purposes only.

The allocation among tipped employees is to be done on the basis of a good faith agreement between the employer and employees. In the absence of such an agreement, the allocation can be made according to regulations issued by the Secretary.

What is a "large food and beverage establishment"? Only large food and beverage establishments are covered by the new rules. These are defined as establishments which provide for consumption on the premises, where the employer normally employed more than 10 employees (including employees not receiving tips) during the preceding calendar year, and where tipping is customary. Carryout, cafeteria and fast food establishments are not covered under this definition.

What if the tipping rate at a large food and beverage establishment is less than 8 percent? The law provides that an establishment can apply to the I.R.S. for a lower percentage to be used in making allocations if it can show that their average tipping rate is less than 8 percent. However, the rate cannot be reduced below 5 percent.

What information must employers report to the I.R.S.? In addition to the reporting of any allocations made among tipped employees, as described above, large food and beverage establishments must now report gross receipts from food and beverage sales, aggregate charge receipts, aggregate tips on charge receipts, and voluntarily reported tip income.

How will this information be reported to the I.R.S. and employees? Employers will file annual information returns with the I.R.S. and will report to each employee, in a space to be added to the W-2 form, the amount allocated to the employee for the year under the rules described above.

When are the new rules effective? The changes made in the Act apply generally to

calendar years after 1982, but the allocation reporting rules are specifically delayed until payroll periods ending after March 31, 1983. Accordingly, for the first quarter of 1983, large food and beverage establishments will report the items indicated above except that no allocations to employees will be reported.

Do these rules change the end-of-year tax liabilities of restaurant employees? No. Employees are required under present and prior law to report actual tips received, no more and no less, on their annual income tax returns. (This amount is also subject to FICA tax.) Employees must be able to substantiate the amount of tips they report with adequate records. The I.R.S. may determine upon audit that a tipped employee received more than the amount reported, even if the amount reported equals or exceeds 8 percent. ●

HUMAN RIGHTS IN GUATEMALA

HON. MICKEY LELAND

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. LELAND. Mr. Speaker, in recent months, the Reagan administration has been arguing that human rights conditions in Guatemala have improved under the Presidency of Efraín Ríos Montt. On the basis of this argument, the administration is now seeking to renew military assistance to that government. I am inserting in the Record the following report by the Council on Hemispheric Affairs, which examines the performance of the Ríos Montt government through December of last year. I believe that it will be of use to my colleagues in understanding the current Guatemalan situation.

The report follows:

A REPORT COMPILED BY OCHA RESEARCH
ASSOCIATE JUDY LAWTON

The United States State Department, having asserted on several recent occasions that human rights in Guatemala have improved, has recommended that the U.S. now vote in favor of Guatemala's bid for regional lending agency development loans. Previously the U.S. had withheld support for the loans because of Guatemalan human rights considerations. According to James Morrell of the Center for International Policy, a U.S. policy shift would affect six loans requested from the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the World Bank totalling \$170 million.

Based on the State Department's recommendations, the Treasury Department plans to support an \$18 million loan request from Guatemala to the IDB for a \$30 million rural telecommunications project, which would have clear military applications. Quick approval of the loan is expected since the U.S. provides about 42 percent of the Bank's capital funds.

More recently, the Reagan administration has signalled that it hopes to proceed with shipping helicopter replacement parts to service Guatemala's aging fleet. The helicopters are deployed to strafe Indian villages suspected of harboring guerrillas, and to transport military units. A Nov. 15 article in the *New York Times* indicated that military shipments may already have taken

place with the direct assistance of U.S. armed forces in violation of existing law.

Congress already has authorized \$10 million under the Caribbean Basin Initiative (CBI) for Guatemala. For fiscal year 1983, the administration is asking for \$15 million in economic and development assistance, \$3.4 million for helicopter spare parts, and \$250,000 for military training funds.

Congressional sources indicate that one immediate by-product of President Reagan's meeting in Honduras with Guatemalan President Efraín Ríos Montt will be an accelerated campaign to convince Congress that the human rights situation in Guatemala justifies supplemental military aid appropriations for that country.

Given the political and economic complications and increased levels of violence associated with U.S. attempts to combat insurgency in El Salvador, the Guatemalan initiative is ominous. Augmented levels of arms shipments to Guatemala would lead, in all probability, to further escalation of a war that has already killed thousands in that country. In four years under the Lucas García regime (July 1978 to March 1982), 5,000 Guatemalans were murdered, according to Amnesty International. And COHA estimates that 4,000 more have been killed since Gen. Efraín Ríos Montt assumed power in March.

SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC IMPOVERISHMENT

Guatemala, due to its recent history of fraudulent elections, military rule, and government-sponsored human rights violations, has accumulated an unsavory international reputation. Extreme poverty has spurred the ongoing social war, matching the rich, in collaboration with the army, against the poor.

Inequities are extreme. Two percent of the landowners hold 72 percent of the agricultural land, while 65 percent of the economically active population works the land. Seventy-four percent of the country's exports are agricultural, but the often ignored legal scale minimum wage in the countryside is only \$3.20 daily. Fifty percent of the economically active population earns \$60.00 a year or less. Thirty-four percent is unemployed.

It is estimated that 72 percent of Guatemalans above the age of seven are illiterate. While there is only one teacher for every 400 children, there is one soldier for every 140 of Guatemala's seven million inhabitants. Eighty-one percent of the children less than five years of age suffer from malnutrition, most of them in the Indian areas.

These statistics illuminate some of the sources of the present civil strife. The Reagan administration, however, views the growing insurgency in Guatemala as a "textbook case" of armed aggression directed by Cuba and the Soviet Union. The current policy change toward Guatemala is justified as a response to the advance of communism. Lt. Gen. Wallace H. Nutting, who heads the U.S. Southern Command based in Panama, said in an interview last August that the "implications of a Marxist takeover are a lot more serious than in El Salvador."

There is a widespread consensus that making development loans available to the current Guatemalan regime or establishing presidential dialogue between the two countries would send the wrong signal to Guatemala City. Numerous Latin American specialists criticized the hastily scheduled Reagan-Ríos Montt meeting in Honduras.

With the legitimization that the loans would convey, and large sums of foreign ex-

change in hand, the Rios Montt government would see little reason to modify its "scorched earth" anti-insurgency tactics. Attempting to root out guerrillas, soldiers raid villages, killing peasants and burning their crops and homes. They have driven over 150,000 Guatemalans to seek refuge in Mexico and Honduras.

The Reagan administration has, over the past year, expressed its desire to renew direct military aid to Guatemala. Aid was refused in 1977 by an indignant Guatemalan government, angered by Carter administration criticism of its human rights record. Since that time, the toll of civilian deaths at the hands of the Guatemalan military continued to mount during the Romeo Lucas Garcia regime, reaching over 1,000 deaths per year. After a brief respite immediately following Lucas' overthrow last March, the scale of violence in the country has escalated.

During the summer of 1981, the Reagan administration urged Lucas to moderate his regime and to support a civilian candidate for the elections to be held on March 7, 1982. As an encouragement, the U.S. government permitted the commercial sale of \$3.2 million worth of jeeps and other vehicles. The hope was that the elections would provide the long-awaited opportunity to overcome congressional and public opposition to the renewal of military aid, a priority of State Department hard-liners.

The elections were a disappointment to the U.S. Lucas Garcia supported the military candidate, Gen. Angel Anibal Guevara, who was awarded the victory by the outgoing Congress amid charges of fraud by the three opposing civilian candidates, Mario Sandoval Alarcon, Alejandro Maldonado Aguirre, and Gustavo Anzueto Vielman. Party leaders of the extreme right National Liberation Movement (MLN), the moderate National Renovation and Christian Democratic parties, and the Authentic Nationalist Party were detained as they marched on the presidential palace to present document which, they claimed, proved that the vote was fraudulent.

The Reagan administration, however, immediately recognized Guevara's victory and sent a letter of congratulations to the palace.

Three days later, on March 23, young military officers staged a bloodless coup and installed Gen. Efraim Rios Montt as the leader of a three-man junta. All three of the members, Rios Montt, Gen. Horacio Maldonado Shaad, and Col. Francisco Gordillo, were associated with previous repressive regimes. Montt served as Army Chief of Staff under President Carlos Arana Osorio, who was known as the "Butcher of Zacapa" and directed a massacre in Sansirisay on May 27, 1973. Maldonado Shaad was also on Arana's staff. Under Lucas Garcia he was Chief of the Honor Guard and considered to be next in line for the Army Chief of Staff. Francisco Gordillo ordered a 1980 bombing on the convent and rectory in Morales, Izabal. He was also involved in campaigns in the departments of El Quiche and Chimaltenango in 1981 in which thousands of peasants were killed.

The backgrounds of these men were an ominous foreboding that the new regime would not hesitate to violate basic human rights, if necessary, in order to curb dissent. But the Reagan administration viewed their assumption of power optimistically, hopeful of an improvement of internal conditions in the country. Rios Montt's words of moderation and conciliation even raised small

hopes at COHA, which adopted a wait-and-see position on Guatemala's new leaders.

The new regime summarized its goals in a fourteen-point program published on April 2:

1. To have citizens feel that the authority is now at their service, instead of the people being at the service of the authority.
 2. To achieve the reconciliation of the Guatemalan family and thus contribute to the national peace and harmony.
 3. To achieve individual safety and peace on the basis of an absolute respect for human rights.
 4. To recover individual and national dignity.
 5. To establish a nationalistic spirit and create the basis for the participation and integration of the different ethnic groups that compose our nation.
 6. To achieve national economic recuperation within the free enterprise system and in accordance with the controls required by our national reality.
 7. To eradicate corruption from the administration and stimulate the public employees to develop a genuine spirit of public service that may constitute the basis of a national government.
 8. To stimulate a new vision focused on development, reform and nationalism within the different power groups that represent the activity of the country.
 9. To make efficient use of the cooperation from other countries and international organizations to strengthen national integration and, at the same time, project towards the outside the challenges faced by the State.
 10. To improve the quality of life to diminish the existing contradictions.
 11. To restructure the electoral system to obtain a real democratic environment where political participation is respected and popular frustrations avoided.
 12. To restructure the Judiciary Branch with the participation of the Bar Associations, in order to adapt it to the prevailing situations and make it ethnically, morally, and juridically functional.
 13. To reorganize the administration in order to expedite the execution of government programs, make the bureaucracy efficient, control its functioning and eradicate administrative anarchy.
 14. To reestablish the constitutionality of the country within a preemptory time with the purpose of letting the Guatemalan citizens learn their duties, responsibilities and rights in a free democratic process.
- Although the program is vague, its words have been used by the State Department as indication of the new Guatemalan government's desire for reform. Armed enemies of the regime, however, had seen new governments come and go and are skeptical of Rios Montt's proposed reforms.

GUATEMALA GUERRILLAS

Unlike its counterpart in El Salvador, the guerrilla movement in Guatemala is mature, and very well organized. The first signs of armed opposition to the Guatemalan order appeared in 1962 when the Guatemalan Workers Party (PGT)—the Communist Party—declared support for armed struggle following massive urban demonstrations against then-President Ydigoras Fuentes. Members of various worker, student and political groups formed the Rebel Armed Forces.

Internal divisions over military and political strategy caused divisions within the FAR in the late 1960s, and in 1968, two groups, the Guerrilla Army of the Poor (EGP), and

the Revolutionary Organization of People in Arms (ORPA), were established as spin-offs of the FAR.

The EGP and ORPA both made conscious efforts to attract the support of Guatemala's substantial Indian population. In fact, some of the leaders of the new organizations were Indians themselves and the groups devoted much of their efforts to activities in the western and northwestern highlands where the indigenous population is largest.

The EGP is by now the most important of the guerrilla organizations having solidified its presence and support in the Indian areas of El Quiche and Huehuetenango. ORPA operates in the provinces of San Marcos and Solola. FAR, which until recently limited its work to the vast Peten region, has begun to enlist support in Chimaltenango, a province much closer to the capital city. The effect of the PGT has been described by experts as negligible although the PGT is active in Guatemala City.

The guerrilla movement boosted itself mightily in February, 1982 with the announcement of a union of all four major groups into the Revolutionary Guatemalan National Unity (UNRG). Although the leaders of the four main rebel groups are Marxist, the February proclamation was written in moderate language in an attempt to win support from non-Marxist opposition groups, Guatemala's middle class, and business leaders.

Hoping to show that it sought a policy of national reconciliation, the new government promulgated an amnesty program in June. The amnesty ostensibly covered "political and related common crimes committed either as authors or accomplices by the persons who... belong or have belonged to the subversive organizations..." But amnesty was also granted to the security forces, "who in compliance with their duties could have participated in anti-subversive actions."

Though according to the government, 2000 rebels turned themselves into the police, the amnesty program was denounced as a "farce" by the guerrilla groups, who viewed it as merely a pardon for those responsible for repressive acts carried out under the Lucas Garcia regime. The guerrilla's claims are supported by the fact that the new government made no effort to prosecute military personnel involved in the carnage of the Garcia regime. Although according to a number of reports, high officers of the Lucas Garcia government were under detention, no move has been made to try any defendants accused of gross crimes. Skeptical forecasts that no action would be taken against the military officer corps, since their support was essential to those in government, were borne out. Some civilians were arrested on corruption charges, but none for human rights violations.

THE STATE DEPARTMENT MOVES TO HELP

At the same time, the State Department moved forward to legitimate the new regime. Stephen Bosworth, Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, went before the International Development Institutions and Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking Committee in strong support of the Rios Montt region. The August 5, 1982 hearings were held to consider the U.S. position toward the \$18 million IDB loan to Guatemala for the rural telecommunications system.

In his testimony Bosworth emphasized that the Guatemalan government faced a

Cuban-backed guerrilla movement. He admitted that political violence continued in the countryside, but blamed it on the guerrillas. "Political violence in rural areas continues and may even be increasing," he said, "but its use as a political tactic appears to be a guerrilla strategy, not a government doctrine." As evidence of the guerrilla role Bosworth cited eyewitness reports of women among the attackers, embassy interviews with massacre survivors, and the use of weapons not in the army inventory. He also claimed that villagers were looking to the army for protection.

Bosworth also contended that the Rios Montt regime planned to carry out a \$5 million work program for refugees of political strife. As further evidence of the new government's good will, Bosworth cited government invitations to Amnesty International, the OAS Inter-American Commission on Human Rights, and the United Nations Human Rights Commission to visit Guatemala and evaluate the situation. The Deputy Secretary claimed that the government was willing to negotiate with the guerrillas unconditionally, and that the guerrillas refused the proposal.

According to Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Human Rights Melvin Levitsky, who also testified before the committee, concurred with Bosworth. He admitted that violence continued in the Guatemalan countryside, but attributed much of it to the guerrillas. "It is no small matter," he said, "that public statements and actions by the government seem to have changed the image of the government from one that engaged in indiscriminate violence to one that not only does not condone such violence by the government forces but is acting to end it."

Bosworth's contentions differ radically from the views expressed by non-governmental observers of developments in Guatemala. Very few believe that the guerrillas are responsible for more than a small fraction of the violence against civilians. Indeed, rather than looking to the army for protection, Indians who have taken refuge abroad maintain that the security forces threatened their lives.

The Guatemalan government has not, in fact, shown any desire to carry on a dialogue with the opposition. Official statements indicate that the government will continue to counter the unrest with force.●

THE DEATH OF MARJORIE GUTHRIE

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note with sadness the passing of one of the Nation's foremost health crusaders, Marjorie Guthrie. Although she made great strides in her lifetime against her family's enemy, Huntington's chorea, she lost a long battle with cancer this weekend.

My friendship with Marjorie goes back many years. Her son Arlo, a constituent of mine, has written my campaign songs, and she and I have worked shoulder to shoulder to insure adequate funding for the National In-

stitute for Neurological and Communicative Disorders and Stroke (NINCDS). Through her work, she hoped that fewer Americans would suffer through debilitating and degenerative diseases needlessly.

Just as her late husband Woody's songs invoked the spirit of this great country, Marjorie Guthrie's battle against the causes of Huntington's chorea represented what has made this Nation strong. Singlehandedly, she founded the Committee to Combat Huntington's Disease and made it into a viable and compassionate organization. Her hope all along was to alleviate suffering in Huntington's disease victims and their families. Our hope is now that her suffering has ended, her battle will still be carried on.

I am inserting for the RECORD her obituary from yesterday's New York Times.

MARJORIE GUTHRIE, SINGER'S WIDOW, 65

Marjorie Mazia Guthrie, who began her career as a dancer but who, in the last 15 years of her life, devoted herself to creating an awareness of Huntington's chorea—a disease that killed her husband, the folk singer Woody Guthrie—died of cancer at her home yesterday. She was 65 years old, and lived in Manhattan.

At the end of her life, Mrs. Guthrie was working on a plan, through the foundation named for her husband, to establish a neurologic wing for research and care at the Helen Hayes Hospital in Haverstraw, N.Y. Huntington's chorea is hereditary and leads to a protracted deterioration of the brain.

In 1967, after the folk singer died, Mrs. Guthrie founded the Committee to Combat Huntington's Disease. It was her hope that treatment would be made available, a cure would be found and families afflicted by the disease would be assisted.

IMPACT ON HER OWN FAMILY

In her own case, once the full impact of Mr. Guthrie's illness on herself and her family was felt, Mrs. Guthrie divorced her husband. She continued to care for their three children and spent much time with him in various hospitals. She taught him to communicate by blinking his eyes, after he had lost control of his other muscles.

"We agreed that we didn't need a piece of paper to hold us together," Mrs. Guthrie told an interviewer in 1977. "I never really divorced him in my heart and in my actions. Divorce was an opportunity for me not to be financially responsible for his hospitalization."

She raised money to pay for publication of the first bibliography of articles on the disease, by the University of Leiden Press in the Netherlands. Through her committee, families in which the disease was present were identified. The first year there were six; now there are almost 10,000.

Mrs. Guthrie was also instrumental in creating the World Federation of Neurology's Research Commission on Huntington's chorea. She headed a Federal commission for control of the disease in 1976 and 1977, and lectured to medical students about the illness and how it affects the patient and the patient's family.

She also headed the public and governmental information committee of the National Committee for Research in Neurologic and Communicative Disorders, was a member of the New York State Commission

on Health Education and Illness Prevention and of the state's Genetic Advisory Committee, and was a lay member of the advisory council of the National Institute of General Medical Service.

Mrs. Guthrie danced with Martha Graham in 1935, under the name of Marjorie Mazia, and became Miss Graham's first assistant in the Graham School of Dance, a position she held for 15 years.

In 1975, Mrs. Guthrie married Martin B. Stein, who was vice president of the Committee to Combat Huntington's Disease. He has since died.

Mrs. Guthrie is survived by two sons Joady and the folk singer Arlo Guthrie; a daughter, Nora Rotante; three brothers, Herbert Greenblatt of Pompano Beach, Fla.; Dave Greenblatt of New York and Bernard Greenblatt of Las Vegas; a sister, Gertrude Mazia of Berkeley, Calif., and six grandchildren.●

H.R. 1718

HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, March 3, the House passed the emergency supplemental appropriations bill, H.R. 1718, which was designed to create jobs and provide humanitarian assistance to the millions of unemployed in this country. Although the bill did not go as far as I would have liked to solve our long-term employment problems, I supported it as a sound first step to stimulate jobs and ease the present suffering of the jobless and their families.

Unemployment is running at a national average of 10.4 percent, leaving about 11 million Americans without a means of providing for their families. Our urban industrial areas were first hit by severe unemployment rates several years ago as the deep recession lingered and plants had to lay off workers due to limited business activity. Pockets of high unemployment have also been springing up in the last year or so in areas which at first had been spared the suffering of unemployment. In Oklahoma, 19 counties now have unemployment rates that are higher than the national average—10 of those counties are in my district.

After closely examining this bill, I was pleased to see that funds were included which will be of great help to our rural areas. The measure includes \$1.25 billion for the community development block grant with 30 percent of the first \$1 billion to be spent on projects in small cities and rural areas. Funds were also included under the Farmers Home Administration for grants and loans to construct sewer and water systems in rural areas—\$200 million in grant funds and \$600 million for new loans. In addition, \$39 million was appropriated to provide water supplies and waste disposal facilities for

Indian homes, and water and sewer system for Indian communities. The Soil Conservation Service would receive \$175 million under this bill for projects to prevent flood damage and for watershed protection and repair. I was happy to see \$200 million provided in the bill for Economic Development Administration (EDA) programs and \$15 million for resource, conservation, and development (RC&D). Both programs had been slated for elimination by the administration.

Congress has a responsibility to do what it can to ease the suffering of the unemployed and their families, even in the face of our current budgetary constraints. In particular, I supported the inclusion in the bill of \$150 million for the low-income home weatherization program and \$225 million for emergency food and shelter services for the unemployed and needy.

The final House-passed bill appropriated \$4.9 billion to create jobs and to provide humanitarian help to the jobless. The bill also included about \$5 billion for the unemployment compensation trust fund which needed funds to be able to provide benefits under the existing unemployment compensation program. No changes were made in the existing program. But, due to the persistent high unemployment rate, additional funds were needed to continue payment of the Federal share of unemployment compensation through the end of fiscal year 1983 and to continue to give loans to States that are unable to make all their regular payments under the program.

As I mentioned earlier, I supported this bill because it was a sound first step in providing jobs and helping ease the pain of the unemployed. But, I believe this bill is a far cry from an overall solution to our unemployment problem. We need to invest in a program to attack our chronic unemployment through increased funding for education and training. The bill deals with the immediate problem, but it is limited—best estimates are that it will provide only about 600,000 jobs. With 11 million Americans out of work, we have to do more. To be fair, we need to provide programs to train and educate our workers to give them hope of providing for their families over the long term.

I am encouraged by the debate in Congress right now on additional measures which will provide education and training programs for the unemployed. Although we are all concerned about our budget deficits and that any future measures must be fiscally sound, I believe that one of the best investments we can make is in the American worker. This bill takes a step in the right direction, but our work is far from over. Let us follow up this effort with responsible measures to provide hope for our workers in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

their future with programs offering training and education opportunities for their long-term job stability.●

"SALUTE TO BABIES," FOR THE MARCH OF DIMES

HON. CARLIS COLLINS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mrs. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, on April 7, 1983, Dr. Effie O. Ellis, a most distinguished physician and quality-of-life consultant in Chicago, will be the leader of a community-wide effort to improve maternal and infant health care. The event, for the benefit of the March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, is called the "Salute to Babies" banquet.

Dr. Ellis, who authored the "salute" theme, said that a salute to babies is in reality a salute to the future. I heartily agree, for the following reasons.

While Dr. Ellis' career and contributions to the field of medicine have been recognized worldwide, her greatest satisfaction has been in serving the people of her city, State, and country. On the Federal level, she has been the medical director of the U.S. Children's Bureau, region 5, and a member of the White House Conference on Children and Nutrition. Most recently, Dr. Ellis has been appointed to the Illinois Governor's Task Force on Children and Youth. In Chicago, she has been a long-valued consultant to the city's department of human services. She has also helped the March of Dimes launch parenting education programs in many States—22—across the Nation.

There is no question that our country suffers from tragic figures regarding infant mortality. According to figures from the U.N. Statistical Office, 11.7 babies per 1,000 live births do not live past the first year of their lives in the United States, compared to countries like Sweden where the infant death rate is only 6.7. In urban areas such as Chicago, the statistics are much more bleak. The infant mortality rate there is 20.6 per 1,000 live births.

This national tragedy need not occur. According to Dr. Ellis and the March of Dimes, the development of the individual begins at conception, but the quality of life of that individual when he or she is born actually begins with the parents.

I do not think that anything can be done until all of us realize that education is the key to the prevention of birth defects. The problem requires the knowledge of our whole society. Schools, being the institutions touched by everybody, are the appropriate places to focus on encouraging healthy babies and healthy mothers.

March 17, 1983

The value of the "Salute to Babies" under the chairmanship of Dr. Ellis simply cannot be calculated. But, as explained in the statement of purpose developed by the banquet's steering committee: "We are coming together to exercise leadership, take responsibility, raise funds and unite our efforts towards improving the quality of life from the very beginning."

I urge you to join Dr. Ellis and me in supporting the March of Dimes' "Salute to Babies" on April 7, and to commit to the strongest possible attack against our country's most tragic child health problem.●

THE PEOPLE'S PARADISE

HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, some form of socialism/communism is dominant in many nations and every continent. The idea of socialism is especially attractive to intellectuals who are able to maintain a comfortable distance from actual Socialist practices.

Though socialism is a god that fails continuously, and causes more human suffering and tragedy than any idea or practice in history, there are those who stubbornly cling to its high-minded idealism. They religiously close up their eyes to the reality that the Socialist promise of instant utopia brings only the tyranny of a real dystopia.

It is for them that the following glimpse of reality is provided:

[From the Washington Inquirer, Mar. 11, 1983]

SOCIALIST DISASTER IN BLACK AFRICA

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

Nigeria's mass expulsion of more than 2 million alien workers is one more example of the economic disaster which is facing the countries of black Africa. In the past year there have been food riots in Sudan, Malawi and Madagascar. Tanzania is on the brink of bankruptcy. Ghana, whose government has been turning to communist models of economic planning, has seen its foreign currency reserves drop to zero. Ghana's factories are crippled by the lack of raw materials. Cocoa production has declined to half its peak. The finance minister, Kwesi Botchway, indicated in a speech in December that the government will continue its policy of price controls. He outlined a plan to set up "people's shops" to sell food and other essential items. He envisions continuing roles for recently developed Workers' Defense Committees and People's Defense Committees. And so it goes.

The foreign debt of Africa's 45 black-governed nations is more than \$60 billion—far out of proportion to what they take in from abroad. Foreign earnings in 1981 totaled some \$28 billion, a drop of \$1 billion from 1980. Deficits have already forced Sudan, Malawi, Zaïre, Zambia and other nations to work out new debt-repayment schedules

with such institutions as the International Monetary Fund. Six others, including Ghana, are involved in similar negotiations.

Bela Balassa of the World Bank, in a study of ten underdeveloped countries, shows that countries pursuing a socialist and protectionist economic policy have fallen far behind those countries pursuing a free market and free trade approach. He compares two African states—Ghana and the Ivory Coast.

In Ghana, import substitution policies encouraged inefficient, high-cost production in manufacturing industries. Taxes on Ghana's main export crop, cocoa, discouraged its production and other crops were adversely affected by Ghana's overvalued exchange rate. The Ivory Coast—following far different policies—increased its share of cocoa exports, developed new primary exports and expanded manufacturing industries by following less protectionist policies. Mr. Balassa claims that "differences in the policies applied may largely explain why, between 1960 and 1978, per-capita income fell from \$430 to \$390 in Ghana, compared with an increase from \$540 to \$940 in the Ivory Coast in terms of 1978 prices.

Dr. Melvin B. Krauss of the Hoover Institute points out that, "Since independence in 1957, Ghana has reeled through five military coups and three civilian governments. Ghana would appear to be an example par excellence of a Third World country where socialism and the welfare state have made totalitarianism a recurrent aspect of political life. Kwame Nkrumah, who was the acknowledged father of African nationalism, also was the father of his country's devastated economy. Mr. Nkrumah's plan . . . was to make the nation economically independent . . . by producing locally everything that up to then had been imported. State-owned factories soon were spinning cotton, sewing clothes, canning food, rolling steel and bottling gin. Nkrumah, in other words, got things off on the wrong—that is, left-foot by a policy of statism and cutting Ghana off from the International economy."

Nkrumah spent heavily on a huge dam, a harbor and shipping fleet, an airport, an airline, roads and bridges, public housing, health facilities and free schools. He nationalized gold mines, plantations, department stores, the cocoa marketing board, even Accra's laundries. Dr. Krauss declares that, "The unhappy results, destruction of the economy, were predictable, though the obvious appeared to have escaped Nkrumah and his socialist supporters."

Under Nkrumah's socialism gold production fell by two-thirds since independence, and state mines are now losing \$7 million a month. In 1962 Nkrumah's government nationalized Ghana's tobacco plantations. Tobacco production this year is expected to be about one-tenth what it was in 1974. "We're paying for their mismanagement," says one Ghanaian official. "A state industry can always accommodate its own incompetence." Ghana's cocoa crop, for 67 years the biggest in the world, is expected to fall to about 270,000 tons this year from 440,000 soon after independence.

The Wall Street Journal notes that, "No industry has suffered from government enthusiasm—in Ghana and almost every other country in Africa—quite so much as agriculture. To keep their politically unsettling city dwellers content, African leaders for years have held food prices low by paying their farmers little. The farmers, with that kind of incentive, are leaving the land and

heading for the cities themselves. Food production has fallen . . . as a result."

Those states in the underdeveloped world which have been progressing economically—Taiwan, Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea—have embraced the philosophy of the free market. Those states which have followed the socialist economic pattern—Ghana, India, Tanzania, Cuba, Pakistan—have been economic disasters. Economist Milton Friedman states that, "In the Far East, Malaysia, Singapore, Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Japan—all relying extensively on private markets—are thriving. Their people are full of hope. An economic explosion is under way in these countries. As best such things can be measured, the annual income per person in these countries in the late 1970s ranged from about \$700 in Malaysia to about \$5,000 in Japan. By contrast, India, Indonesia, Communist China, all relying heavily on central planning, have experienced economic stagnation and political regression. The annual income per person in those countries was less than \$250."

Now, those mismanaged African states—such as Ghana—are asking the U.S. and other Western countries to bail them out. The best thing we can do for such countries is to give them the benefits of our free market system, not provide them with additional dollars to fritter away. As long as socialism—in one form or another—characterizes their economic organization, their decline will continue. "There is not a single case," states Dr. Krauss, "where a left-wing authoritarian regime produced anything but economic dislocation, ruin and stagnation. Cuba, Tanzania, Jamaica are all economic busts . . . the biggest obstacle to the economic development of the Third World is big government."●

A TRIBUTE TO ALAN B. DEUTSCHMAN

HON. MATTHEW J. RINALDO

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. RINALDO. Mr. Speaker, I would like to invite my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Alan B. Deutschman of Marlboro, N.J., and the other State winners of the 1983 Voice of Democracy contest conducted by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary. As in past years, the winning contestant from each State was brought to Washington, D.C., to be honored by the sponsoring organizations.

Alan, a 17-year-old senior at Marlboro High School in New Jersey's Seventh Congressional District, was one of the more than 250,000 talented secondary school students to compete for the five national scholarships awarded as top prizes. As the New Jersey winner, he was 1 of the 50 contestants invited to the Nation's Capital for the final round of judging.

Because it represents an outstanding effort by an exceptional young man, I would like to share Alan's speech with my colleagues. It was judged the best

of the entries from New Jersey and one of the best in the Nation.

YOUTH—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

(By Alan B. Deutschman)

To run faster than anyone has run before. To jump higher, to throw further, to do what has never been done. These are the goals of America's young athletes as they compete in the Olympic games. America's young men and women strive for greatness, attempting to reach new dimensions in athletic achievement.

The spirit of these young athletes is the spirit of American youth: striving for their inner best, trying to equal the achievement of past generations and surpassing them with new displays of brilliance. It is this spirit which is always driving America to seek the ideal, the best that can be done. It is this spirit which makes Youth—America's Strength.

Oscar Wilde observed, "The youth of America is their oldest tradition." If we look at the history of our young nation, we can see the spirit of American youth in action.

America was founded as a new nation, built on new ideas, a young challenger to the mighty British empire. The young people of America, like their young nation, have never turned away from a challenge. Since our nation began American youth has always sided with the underdog, unafraid to buck the odds and to try what has never been done.

As the young nation grew older, America settled the western frontier. The pioneering spirit was born in America's young, the spirit of the cowboy in the Wild West: brash, rowdy, adventurous, daring, blazing new trails and opening up the great frontier.

The spirit of the young American cowboy later became the morale of the young American GI soldier as our nation fought two World Wars to defend our ideals and to fight tyranny. In war the youth of America became the hope of the nation, the people to get the job done and restore peace to the world.

As America entered more recent times, new frontiers began to open. A young president with high ideals told the world that an American would walk on the moon, and sure enough America conquered the frontier of space as it had conquered the frontier of the West.

Today, young Americans are giving the nation new ideas and new solutions to vital issues such as world peace, the environment, and energy. Young Americans led the Ground Zero Week program to inform the world about the horror of nuclear war. It is young Americans who lead movements to conserve energy for the future and to save our endangered environment. The young see old problems with a fresh, inventive approach. Their spirit is best reflected by the words of Robert Kennedy, who said that some men look at things that have been and ask why—I dream of things that never were and ask why not?

Adventurous, bold, daring, inventive—the spirit of American youth. Seeking new ideas and new solutions, American youth is the hope of the future.

The Olympic athletes equalled the records set in past years and then surpassed them, setting new records and achievements. In the same manner, America's youth must take the ideals and achievements of past generations and create a new world, fulfilling the dream of a better tomorrow. And like the young Olympic athletes, America's

youth must be a showcase to the world of America's strength.●

AN UNJUST ATTACK ON CHILDREN

HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to discuss with my colleagues what I consider to be an unjust attack on the viability of this country's future. That attack is occurring in the form of budget cuts for child nutrition programs.

Mr. Speaker, if President Reagan was as committed to the betterment of our national security as he claims, he would be increasing and not reducing funding levels for child nutrition programs. I believe that a nation that fails to invest in all of its young, is jeopardizing its real national security.

We are all aware of the fact that a healthy body must coexist with a healthy mind in order for a child to maximize his learning potential. Study after study has shown the correlation between a child's nutritional intake and his ability to learn.

It is evident from past and present actions that the administration does not recognize the importance of this correlation. Rather, under the guise of improving national defense and reducing budget deficits, President Reagan has continued his assault on our Nation's greatest resource, our youth, by drastically reducing funding for essential nutritional programs.

In 1981, child nutrition programs suffered heavily under the Reagan budget ax. The school lunch program was cut by 30 percent, or by \$1 billion a year, for fiscal year 1982. These cuts were achieved primarily by lowering eligibility requirements for free and reduced-price meals, and by reducing Federal subsidies for school lunches.

In addition, the school breakfast program was also cut by about 20 percent, and the summer food service program by about 35 percent.

In 1982, the administration once again proposed deep additional cuts in the school breakfast, child care food, and summer food service programs. As a result of these cuts, the number of participating children in the school lunch program fell by over 3 million. Thirty-five percent of the decline came in the free and reduced-price categories.

Ironically, while the President was busy cutting funds and tightening eligibility requirements, the economic situation continued to worsen, causing an increase in the number of newly poor and unemployed parents whose children would now require free or reduced school meals.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

For fiscal year 1984, the Reagan proposals for child nutrition programs do not depict a brighter picture. The new cuts proposed by the administration are directly aimed at those who can least afford these cuts—low-income children. Included in the administration fiscal year 1984 proposals are:

First, repealing the school breakfast program, the child care food program, and the summer feeding program, and replacing them with a general nutrition assistance grant at greatly reduced funding. These programs play a vital role in the Federal effort to protect the nutritional health and well-being of our children. The implementation of this block-grant approach would be an abdication of Federal responsibility to provide nutritional assistance to our children.

Second, a 6-month delay in cost-of-living adjustments in school lunch reimbursements. The administration's rationale for this proposal is that this program was overindexed from 1978 to 1982. However, the administration has ignored the fact that school lunch programs are not indexed to the consumer price index, but are adjusted to reflect changes only in food prices. This program was not overindexed during this period. In fact school lunch reimbursements were cut during this period as a result of successive rounds of budget cuts in 1981 and 1982.

Third, raising the price of reduced-price lunches, and finally,

Fourth, requiring families to apply for free and reduced-price lunches through food stamp offices. I find this last provision particularly disturbing. Millions of the children receiving free and reduced-price lunches come from families that do not participate in the food stamp program. Requiring them to register at the food stamp office may cause many children to drop out of the program because their families are too proud to deal with welfare authorities.

It is clear that the administration lacks compassion for our children. They want to degrade and dehumanize the families involved so that their children will not participate in what the administration believes is welfare program. The school lunch program and child nutrition program is not a welfare program; rather, it is truly an investment in our future.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that the Reagan administration has singled out our youth to bear the burden of misguided policies. It is even more unfortunate that some of these children, because of their impoverished situation, are lacking in the most basic human necessities. It is our responsibility as Members of Congress to take the plight of the Nation's children into our own hands. We must make sure that they are provided for, so they will have a chance to grow up

March 17, 1983

and become productive citizens. We owe at least that much to them, and to our country.

I urge my colleagues not to accept the administration's budget proposals for child nutrition programs.●

AID TO ISRAEL A REAL BARGAIN

HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, today I want to call to the attention of my colleagues an enlightening editorial article that appeared early this year in the Intermountain Jewish News. This editorial, which was based on a study conducted by my good friend and colleague, the honorable Senator from Minnesota, RUDY BOSCHWITZ, I insert at this point in the RECORD.

AMERICAN AID TO ISRAEL THE BARGAIN BEHIND THE BLUSTER

In a recent study, Rudy Boschwitz of Minnesota has put the issue of American aid to Israel in perspective. How much is Israel really costing America? Is it worth it? Is Israel a burden or a bargain? Senator Boschwitz has unscrambled the statistics and penetrated the bureaucratic jargon to reveal the following:

The United States lays out in "foreign aid" to Israel a sum which amounts to about 4 percent of what the United States lays out to Great Britain, France, Italy, and West Germany. This year, when Israel will get about \$3 billion, NATO countries will get \$50 to \$80 billion—but you never hear about it. This is because in the wonderful world of bureaucracy the money sent to Israel is called "foreign aid." It is quietly stored away in the defense budget.

A few more facts: Israel pays back upwards of one-half of the American aid it gets, while NATO pays back nothing. This year, for example, Israel will be paying out \$900 million in accumulated principle and interest on previous American loans, which means that the actual cash outlay to Israel from America this year will not be \$3 billion, but about \$2 billion. Furthermore, of that \$2 billion, all of its defense-related portion will be spent in the United States, thereby creating jobs not for Israelis but for Americans. By contrast, the money which the United States spends on NATO creates jobs for both American soldiers and for one million Europeans.

What is America getting for the money it sends to Israel? It gets the latest intelligence information on the latest, most advanced Soviet weaponry. Israel, not NATO, is supplying the United States with this information. Israel, not NATO, is keeping the Soviet Union out of the Middle East—as convincingly demonstrated last June by the Israel Air Force's utter rout of Soviet-armed Syrian attempts to overtake Lebanon. And Israel is doing this with just a few percentage points of the aid which America ships overseas.

What is more, Israel is no drain on American trade. While Japan has an \$18 to \$20 billion positive trade balance with the United States, Israel has a consistently neg-

ative trade balance with the U.S. This means that the money which America ships to Israel for economic assistance eventually finds its way back to America in the form of Israeli imports of American goods.

You hear a lot about Israel having received around \$20 billion in aid from America in the last 10 years. The figure is accurate. What you do not hear is that NATO will receive about six times that amount for the next (1983) fiscal year alone. And NATO does not pay back, while Israel pays back about 50 percent of the aid it receives.

Furthermore, Israel is basically paying its own way, using American aid simply to supplement what is the highest per capita defense budget in the world, while Japan, Italy, France, and West Germany consistently underspend America not only in absolute terms but also in the degree of GNP devoted to defense. NATO countries are asking America to do a job which NATO should be doing a lot more of itself, while Israel is simply asking for supplementary help.

Consider this, too: Israel receives only American money, while NATO receives American money and men. When Israel fights Soviet proxies (such as Syria) in the Middle East, it is Israeli soldiers who die, while for NATO it is American soldiers who defend Europe.

Take it all around, American aid to Israel is a bargain: Israel doesn't take much; what it does take it either spends in America or pays back to America in trade; and in return for its aid to Israel, America gets an ally which not only talks but acts to keep the Soviets out of the Middle East, and also keeps democracy alive in the Middle East. Take it all around, American aid to Israel is a bargain. ●

THE END OF MANDATORY RETIREMENT

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives voted to make several very important reforms to the social security system. These reforms were necessary in part because there are fewer and fewer older Americans who are able to remain in the work force in their later years. There are many reasons for this, but one important cause of early retirement is age discrimination.

Today I am introducing legislation to abolish mandatory retirement and other forms of age discrimination in employment. I am joined in this effort by EDWARD R. ROYBAL, the chairman of the House Select Committee on Aging, and MATTHEW RINALDO, the ranking minority member of the Aging Committee. A companion bill is also being introduced by Senator HEINZ, chairman of the Senate Aging Committee, and Senator GLENN, the ranking minority member of the Senate Aging Committee.

This bill is a very simple amendment to the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967. It merely removes

the upper age of 70, thereby extending all protections of the act to workers age 70 and older. The bill does include a temporary exemption for tenured faculty of universities and colleges to allow the academic system to adjust to the elimination of mandatory retirement.

We know that age discrimination in employment is a major problem. In fiscal year 1982 the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which is charged with enforcement of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act, received more than 11,000 charges of age discrimination. This represents more than a 100-percent increase in charges filed since 1979.

The public is aware of age discrimination in employment and most Americans favor its elimination. In recent national surveys conducted by Lou Harris & Associates for the National Council on Aging, 8 of 10 Americans indicated that "most employers discriminate against older workers." In a 1981 survey of employers nationwide, conducted by William M. Mercer, Inc., it was discovered that 61 percent of these employers believed "older workers today are discriminated against in the employment marketplace." Opposition to age discrimination is strong. In the Lou Harris survey 9 of 10 Americans reportedly oppose age discrimination in the form of forced retirement because of age. And, this sentiment has grown stronger in recent years.

Age discrimination contributes to unemployment and other financial and psychological problems of older Americans. A study conducted by the House Select Committee on Aging in October 1982 found that unemployment among workers age 55 and older is growing faster than among all other age groups. Moreover, once unemployed, older workers remain out of a job much longer than younger workers. And, those age 60 and older are three times as likely as all other adults to give up and withdraw from the work force once they have become unemployed. As a result, there are more than 334,000 "discouraged" workers over the age of 55. When these discouraged workers are added to the "officially unemployed" the number of jobless older persons rises to more than 1.1 million.

Age discrimination prematurely severs older workers from their livelihood and from a sense of identity and identification with their community. It also creates economic havoc. Older workers who have become unemployed suffer from lower wages and lower job status if they are able to reenter the work force at all. Each additional year of unemployment costs an older worker \$50 a year in reemployment wages. Thus, an unemployed worker with 30 years seniority will lose \$1,300 more in wages upon reemployment

than a similarly situated worker who had only 10 years seniority.

No legislation can completely solve a problem as pervasive as age discrimination in employment. The attitudes of employers and the public at large must be changed to reflect the changing realities of a more productive, capable and willing older worker. Negative stereotypes still abound and until these are eradicated we will be forced to contend with age discrimination in the workplace.

But research clearly shows that if we enact legislation to abolish mandatory retirement by the year 2000 more than 195,000 older workers will be able to remain in the work force. This simple change alone would add several billion dollars a year to the social security fund. According to official estimates by the Social Security Administration, the elimination of mandatory retirement would help to solve the long-term financing problem of social security. Removing obstacles that face older workers is a much better way of solving social security's problems than either raising the entitlement age, as was done in the House-passed legislation last week, or of reducing future benefits. The elimination of obstacles is a much more humane way to deal with declining labor force participation among older workers than the punitive measures that are included in the social security legislation.

Despite the widespread support for the elimination of mandatory retirement, there are critics of this legislation. Some members of the business community believe that the Age Discrimination in Employment Act provides too many rights to older workers. We have heard arguments that the right to a trial by jury, for example, provides a bias in favor of an older worker who brings a legal action against his employer. There is not a grain of evidence to support this allegation and certainly no evidence to suggest that older workers should be denied a fundamental right that is offered to all other Americans in most other parts of the law.

Another argument by some members of the business community is that damage awards allowed under the ADEA are unfair. The "liquidated damage" award allowed by the ADEA is based on that available under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938. Plaintiffs are entitled to such damage awards only if they can prove that the employer willfully violated the ADEA. This is also a reasonable protection and is not unfavorably biased against employers.

The legislation I am introducing today would not affect any of the basic protections that exist in the ADEA. It would merely expand the number of older workers who are protected by the act. Removing the upper

age limit in the ADEA would add approximately 840,000 workers age 70 and over to the 28 million workers—age 40 to 70—now covered by the act. This would be a 3-percent increase in the number of individuals protected against age discrimination in employment.

Some would argue that eliminating mandatory retirement, particularly in a time of high unemployment, would have adverse effects on older women, minorities and youth. The data refute this. The Labor Department found that the raise in permissible mandatory retirement age to 70, as was accomplished by our 1978 amendments, resulted in only negligible effects on women, minorities and youth and that abolishing mandatory retirement would have a similarly minimal impact. According to the Labor Department:

The estimated additional number of comparable age 65 workers are potential competition for less than one-quarter of one percent of all full-time workers age 16-24; less than one-half of one percent of all full-time black workers age 16-59; and around one-tenth of one percent of all full-time female workers age 16-59.

Another argument is that eliminating mandatory retirement would inhibit promotional opportunities for younger workers. Again, the findings of the Labor Department refute this idea. One study reports that a 10-percent increase in the labor force participation rates of men age 65-plus—twice the projected impact of eliminating mandatory retirement—would delay, on average, promotions at the highest ranks by only one-half year, while at the lower ranks individual promotions would be retarded by approximately 5 to 10 weeks. These are insignificant effects, especially when weighed against the harmful consequences of forced retirement based on age.

There is, however, one group who face unique employment circumstances and who are, therefore, temporarily exempted from the protections of this legislation. These are tenured faculty of universities and colleges who, because of their unique "tenure" system face a very different employment situation than most other workers. Arguments by representatives of both the academic institutions and faculty indicate that eliminating mandatory retirement at this time would be a significant threat to the tenure system and to academic freedom. This threat is compounded by the unique demographic situation facing colleges and universities, a situation which will diminish in importance over the next 15 years. Therefore, this bill includes an exemption for tenured faculty for the next 15 years, after which faculty will be extended all the protections of the ADEA after the age of 70. No other employment situation is comparable to academic institutions. There-

fore, an exemption for any other group that is not already provided by the ADEA would be unacceptable.

It is my great hope that this legislation can be enacted as swiftly as possible. There are many thousands of older Americans who are capable of working and would like to remain productive members of their society. This legislation will open doors for these people, allowing them to make important contributions to the economy, to their own personal well-being and to the social security system.

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. —

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Age Discrimination in Employment Amendments of 1983".

SEC. 2. Section 12 of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 (29 U.S.C. 631-634) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a) by striking out "but less than 70 years of age",

(2) in subsection (c)(1) by striking out "but not 70 years of age," and

(3) by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(d) This Act does not prohibit the compulsory retirement of any employee who attains, before July 1, 1998, 70 years of age and who is serving under a contract of unlimited tenure (or similar arrangement providing for unlimited tenure) at an institution of higher education, as defined in section 1201(a) of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1141(a))."

SEC. 3. This Act and the amendments made by section 2 shall take effect on January 1, 1984, except that with respect to any employee who is subject to a collective bargaining agreement—

(1) which is in effect on March 14, 1983,

(2) which terminates after January 1, 1984,

(3) any provision of which was entered into by a labor organization (as defined by section 6(d)(4) of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 (29 U.S.C. 206(d)(4)), and

(4) which contains any provision that would be superseded by such amendments, but for the operation of this section, such amendments shall not apply until the termination of such collective bargaining agreement or January 1, 1987, whichever occurs first.●

"VOICE OF DEMOCRACY" CONTEST

HON. JERRY HUCKABY

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HUCKABY. Mr. Speaker, as Members of the House know, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its ladies auxiliary conduct the nationwide "Voice of Democracy" contest. This contest for high school students attracted over 250,000 entries from over 8,000 high schools this year.

I am honored that the State winner from Louisiana, Mr. Robert S. Hurst, is from West Monroe, La., in my dis-

trict. Rob, who attends West Monroe High School, has established a commendable record of achievement.

In reading Rob's winning speech, I was impressed with his thoughts about America's young people, and their spirit. I would like to commend his speech to the attention of the House:

ROBERT S. HURST'S WINNING SPEECH

To be sixteen, a senior in high school, and a future adult is a scary thought, especially when the future of your family, community and country will rest upon your shoulders. That's why we, the youth, can be America's weakness or strength. In high school we take Civics, American History, Free Enterprise and American Government. What do most of the youth that come out of high school know? They know we have 9 supreme court justices, 100 senators, 435 congressmen, and that George Washington was our first President and not much more. A very discouraging thought when a lot of adults pass on to their children that there is absolutely nothing we can do about government. So why worry about E.R.A., human rights, Soviet-U.S. relations, and defense spending? Let me just worry about my problems and everything will work out just fine.

The 1970's were deemed the "ME" decade. People went on diets, went to health spas, and jogged to improve themselves. The slogan of the army, "Be all that you can be," became the religion of the 70's. This was a far cry from the 60's when the youth searched for a cause to fight for, whether it had been to save the whales or stop the Vietnam War. It might not have been something upon which we all agreed, but you could be sure that someone was somewhere picketing about it. It seems that the present-day growing culture of narcissism has been smothering the idea that maybe we should have some cause to fight for. One rarely does this now unless he is striking for higher wages.

In Greek Mythology there was once a beautiful young boy who while walking along a spring one day, noticed himself in the water and fell in love with his reflection. He just stood there until he pined away and was transformed to the flower Narcissus. Have we, the youth, literally fallen in love with ourselves? Surely his fate won't be our future.

The 80's are spawning an era of new conservatism. The doubts and fears of the 60's and 70's seem to be slowly dissipating. Though the drug, alcohol, personal and political problems are still very apparent, we do seem to care. We seem to have a better understanding of ourselves as individuals and don't need to take off a couple of years after high school to find ourselves. We know better what we want from life and how to get it. Our lives aren't aimless and we are determined to do something within the framework of our existing society. With this new self-awareness, "ME" isn't coming first all the time.

This is shown in the drastic increase of volunteer work. One group of students literally became big brothers and sisters to a local orphanage when they raised money to take the children to ball games and the circus, a chance they wouldn't have had otherwise. Others raised money for Muscular Dystrophy with a dance marathon, while many students devoted countless hours toward the Special Olympics. The list goes on. We are also becoming involved in our nation's political process. One high school

declared a Unity Day for the American hostages in Iran, and believe it or not, Reaganomics is meaning more than something we heard on TV during a news brief.

This new light, this light that is beginning to shimmer in the 80's, shows us we can improve ourselves as well as our society, a society with one of the few governments in the world that is of the people, by the people, and for the people, a government where its youth have fought and died to preserve the freedoms we now have. Our youth are the only real strength and hope America has. For in our history the youth have at times gone astray, but if you could ask us now whether we would rise to the problems at hand, we would turn around and say without hesitation and with the strength of 200 years of the ideals of democracy behind us that "We will." ●

FOREIGN TRADE POLICY

HON. ALAN B. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to speak to the Members of the House on an issue of critical importance to me, to the residents of the First District of West Virginia, and to every American citizen. This issue is our foreign trade policy. While the steel mills and coal mines of the West Virginia panhandle, are over 6,000 miles from Japan, our foreign trade policies bring the two areas much closer. Unfortunately, it is these policies that have added insult to the recession-induced injuries already experienced by our workers. Our weak economy had damaged all of us, but it has dealt a particularly severe blow to workers in U.S. industries that have been targeted by other nations. The results of this targeting are clear when one reviews the facts. While 140,000 American steel workers are unemployed, this country imported 17 million tons of steel in 1982. While the raw domestic steel industry operating at less than 36 percent capacity, the lowest capacity since 1932, foreign steel-producing nations capture 22 percent of our entire steel market. For every dollar the United States earns in steel and iron exports to Japan, we spend \$80 on steel and iron products from the same country.

Proponents of high technology claim that this basic industry is a steel dinosaur in a postindustrial era. I believe, however, that what has happened to steel, despite efforts to modernize our plants and despite wage concessions agreed to by unions, can and will wound every other sector of our economy. This imbalance is pervasive, not industry-specific, and our foreign trade policies have failed to respond to this challenge.

It is these policies that find us giving Brazil 1.2 billion dollars' worth of aid in 1982. This vast amount of money permits the Government of Brazil to

spend its revenue on other items, such as its burgeoning commuter aircraft industry. The Bank of Brazil, which is owned by the Government, offers its aircraft manufacturing company 85 to 90 percent financing at 8½ to 9 percent interest. This approach has been successful for Brazil. Evidence of this is the fact that in the last 5 years, that country's aircraft manufacturer's share of the U.S. market has increased from 7.4 percent to 38 percent. During this same time period, one major American manufacturer's share of the market decreased from 60 percent to 24 percent.

Clearly no American company can compete on an equal footing with such predatory financing. I am not suggesting we imitate Brazil. I am suggesting, however, that our previous attempts to promote free trade have been met with a series of premeditated and unfair foreign trade practices, imposed upon us by some of the very countries to whom we provide aid. Therefore, I believe that we have no alternative but to impose additional restrictions on imports, compelling other nations to deal with us on an equal basis.

Ultimately these unfair foreign trade practices will have an adverse effect on every sector of the American economy. No longer will the steel industry be labeled a lone dinosaur, for we will be a nation of dinosaurs—large, but unable to compete effectively with other nations unless we act now to modify our foreign aid policies to bring them in line with the world of today. ●

LEFT OUT

HON. MARCY KAPTUR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the House of Representatives contemplates its next steps in putting our unemployed back to work, I commend to my colleagues the cover story in the March 21, issue of Newsweek magazine. It clearly depicts the critical situation facing our Nation's industrial heartland and its people. This article reinforces the stance taken by many of us that specific action directed toward industrial America is imperative. The time for action is now. When the heralded recovery finally becomes recognizable, we in Congress must make sure that it is visible to all Americans regardless of where they live and work.

[From Newsweek, Mar. 21, 1983]

LEFT OUT

(By Peter McGrath with Richard Manning and John McCormick)

Bad news in the Monongahela Valley comes as a ripple of voices across the shop floor: another mill gone down, another bri-

gade of workers on the street, another pack of wolves at their families' doors. So it was on the grim December day in 1981 when U.S. Steel announced the closure of its fabled Edgar Thomson Works in Braddock, Pa., the birthplace of big steel. That was the day Tom Medved, then a 39-year-old roller in the slab mill, found himself abruptly out of work, after 19 years and 364 days at E.T., as the plant is locally known. Since his layoff, Tom Medved has not held a regular job of any kind—and he's beginning to wonder if he'll ever work again.

It is a long, hard fall. In the good times when E.T. was turning out flat-rolled steel for the U.S. auto industry, Medved brought home nearly \$1,000 every two weeks. Today he and his wife and four children survive on supplementary unemployment benefits, called "sub," equal to only 30 percent of his base pay at the mill, or about \$600 a month. Their duplex apartment rents for \$125 a month, utilities come to almost \$200. Then there are meals to pay for: the remaining money doesn't go far with hungry children at home, especially 18-month-old Tom, who steals food from his three sisters' plates if they don't eat quickly enough. Worse, Medved's medical insurance ran out in January and he can't afford a new plan. "I figure if something happens to my kids the hospital won't be able to turn them down," he says. He shakes his head when he recalls his length of service at E.T.: after one more day on the job, Tom Medved would have been a 20-year man, eligible for a supplementary employment benefit equal to 85 percent of his base pay. Even so, no sub can last forever. Sooner or later, the precariousness of life in industrial America makes itself felt to everyone who lives there. "I figured there would always be work," says Tom Medved. He figured wrong.

Tom Medved is not alone. All over America's industrial heartland, from the steel country of western Pennsylvania to Michigan's automobile towns, from the machine-tool factories of Illinois to the red iron-ore pits of Minnesota's Mesabi Range, the national faith in prosperity forever is fading. In its place are the brute realities of silent machinery and boarded-up storefronts, of once proud men waiting in welfare lines and leaden-eyed women staring from their windows. Recovery will come to the rest of the country, but the Midwestern depression belt and other pockets of traditional industry from Baltimore to Birmingham, Ala., will be left out. Not anytime soon will American automakers build 9.7 million cars a year as they did a decade ago; never again will American steel employ 650,000 workers.

The Midwest once was the bedrock of the wealth that made the United States the envy of the world. Here Andrew Carnegie produced the rails that tamed the West. Here Henry Ford invented the assembly line, along with the unheard-of wage of \$5 a day, and made modern industry possible. And with modern industry came economic mobility; the ore-laden freighters and around-the-clock factories lifted many blue-collar Americans into the middle class—upward movement on a scale never seen before.

Civic pride flourished. Carnegie gave Braddock the first of the thousands of free public libraries he was to endow throughout the world, with turreted towers and beveled-glass windows, an indoor swimming pool and two bowling alleys. Flint, Mich., received from General Motors moguls a limestone cultural complex that would be the envy of any city twice the size; the Sloan Museum

there testifies to American industry's exuberance with an exhibit of free-spirited experimental car models. Hibbing, Minn., astride an iron-ore lode described as 110 miles long and billions of dollars deep, boasted a municipal zoo, the country's first bookmobile, and a public-school auditorium with crystal chandeliers. The police wore imported Panama hats. In 1920, with a population of only 15,000, Hibbing managed expenditures of \$3.3 million—almost as much as the budget for the entire state of Rhode Island that year. By 1947, President Harry Truman would say, with only slight exaggeration, "I know Hibbing; that's where the high school has gold doorknobs."

No more: as Hibbing's best-known son, Bob Dylan, wrote in a song about hard times in his hometown, "... the cardboard filled windows, and old men on the benches, tell you now that the whole town is empty." The town is empty, too, in places like Braddock, where Edgar Thomson's 140 acres lie in sarcophagus silence; even with the firing-up this week of a blast furnace, the mill employs only 650 workers, compared with 4,400 at the peak of its activity. The town's population has dwindled to 6,000, from a postwar high of 22,000, and municipal services are almost nonexistent. Last year, the fire department disbanded and the volunteer crew that took its place said it would be unable to answer emergency ambulance calls; 10 days later a woman in labor, stranded, had her baby in the kitchen sink. The schools, like Carnegie's grand Romanesque library, are closed, and the main streets are all but deserted. Braddock is dying, and the rest of the Monongahela Valley is not far behind. Says 35-year-old Mark Wasik, a laid-off steelworker from the neighboring borough of Homestead, "I don't think the layoff will ever end. The handwriting's on the wall."

The handwriting is on the wall, and it reads "Help Wanted: None" and "Sorry, Not Hiring." the official unemployment rate in Flint is 24.6 percent, reflecting the loss of 20,000 jobs at General Motors. Hibbing claims a jobless rate of 28.4 percent, but local officials privately put it closer to 40 percent. Rockford, Ill., a toolmaking town whose factories serve factories elsewhere, lost 17,000 manufacturing jobs in the last three years. "We now have 23,000 people classed as unemployed," says Rockford labor analyst Charles Sinclair. "There was a time in 1966 when we only had 50 people actually drawing unemployment benefits." In 1981 the steel industry alone laid off 86,000 workers in the Monongahela Valley.

FATHERS AND SONS

The burden falls most heavily on the younger workers. At the General Motors warehousing center in Flint, only workers with 18 or more years on the job still punch the clock. Everyone hired after 1965 has been laid off. At Flint's Chevrolet manufacturing plant, nobody with less than 14 years is working—and people with less than five years have no hope of ever being called back. Seniority sets the rules: a 35-year-old worker with a family of five gets less consideration than a worker of 55 whose children are grown. Even with an economic recovery, says Mayor Dick Nordvold of Hibbing, "there are miners who won't make the call-back. They're the young people. They're going to have to be retrained, or they're going to have to leave."

It was never meant to be this way. In years past, factory employment was a family tradition, passed from fathers to sons, from mothers to daughters. "My

father worked at E.T. for 40 years," says Tom Medved. "My uncles and cousins all worked there. It was the natural thing to do." A job in the industry meant security, presumably for life: "I used to get out to the mine 30 or 45 minutes early maybe talk with the guys or play cards," says Steve Makar-rall, 28, a laid-off heavy-equipment operator at the U.S. Steel ore mine outside Hibbing. "It was the best job I ever had, I loved it. I was going to stay there till I was 65, and go live on a lake somewhere. All of a sudden, the bottom drops out."

Immigrants may suffer even more than native-born Americans, so much greater is their hope for the American dream. George Papson, a 50-year-old machinist from Rockford, is a good example: he came to the United States from Greece in 1950 to start his life over. His father belonged to the Resistance during World War II. The Nazis came to the house one day to flush the senior Papson out. George, then only 10, was hungry; the soldiers, with seeming generosity, boiled him an egg—then pressed the scalding shell against his bare arm. The boy's screams brought his father out of hiding; the Nazis captured him, then killed him. George was sent to the United States in the vain hope that he might forget. "I wanted to live in heaven on earth," he says now. "That is why I came to America." But heaven could wait: last March George Papson was laid off, with precisely 10 minutes' notice. He has not worked since. "I came here, I worked 30 years," he says. "I became middle class. I got a big house. Now I can't find a job . . . I can take a piece of metal in my hands and make it match a blueprint within a tolerance of half a thousandth of an inch. But now what will happen to me?"

A GROWING DESPAIR

Now what will happen to me? The word—ing suggests an uncharacteristic passivity, even despair. But the lesson of the past several years is that taking charge doesn't always yield results. Fred O'Connor, a 40-year-old lathe operator from Rockford, trekked across the Midwest in search of new employment after his layoff six months ago. From Logansport, Ind., to Marysville, Ohio, the response has been the same: no vacancy. "I've been practically spit on when I've tried to apply for a job," he says. "They don't want to hire you; they don't even want to see you coming." At Rockwell International's Rockford printing-press plant, O'Connor had been earning more than \$12 an hour, but he's becoming reconciled to the idea of a new line of work for less money. "In a few years I imagine I'll be in some job paying \$4 to \$5 an hour," he says. "If I can get it."

Meanwhile, life must go on. "I used to have all the money in the world but no time," says Don Brooks, a furloughed electrician at the National Steel Pellet Co. mine outside Hibbing. "Now I've got all the time in the world but no money." He also has an eight-month-old son with serious medical problems: the child was born with no connection from his esophagus to his stomach and required surgery. Next came a virus that hospitalized him for four weeks. In all, the baby's health-care bills have mounted past \$30,000, and the family budget is showing the strain. "My mortgage payment and health insurance take up three unemployment checks a month," says Brooks. "That leaves one week's check for utilities and food—not to mention car insurance and all the rest." He smiles ruefully, "I used to make more than \$12 an hour," he adds.

"Our contracts says I've gotten a raise since I got laid off. Now I'm making more than \$13 an hour."

Brooks remembers happier days when all the workers enjoyed the middle-class life. "Most people around here spent their money on toys," he says. "Boats, cars, four-wheel drives—the idea was to go anywhere you wanted to go. It was as if nothing could stop you." Overtime was so plentiful a worker could afford to take days off on a whim—"It was all gravy . . . You'd get up in the morning and you'd say, 'It's Wednesday—that's a good reason not to go to work today.' So you call the mine to say you weren't coming in, and then you'd head uptown. The question used to be, 'What do we want to do?' Now it's 'What can we do?'"

Mostly, workers on layoff kill time. Don Brooks volunteers for projects at his church. Others scrounge part-time work, almost as much to have something to do as for the money. Some find themselves in strange roles: men accustomed to leaving at dawn for an early shift now walk their children to the school-bus stop and hang shyly from the lampposts, waiting for the bus to come. Others help out at union halls, organizing a food bank, or fielding questions about welfare. In tapped-out towns like Braddock, the food bank is a lifeline: more than 700 Braddock families each month take home three pounds of hamburger, one dozen eggs, four cans of vegetables and a pound of cheese or margarine—not a lot, but in too many households the difference between eating and going hungry.

Hunger is a new and humiliating experience. "At first I felt really depressed about having to come here," says former Chevrolet worker Dave Anderson, 25, over a bowl of barley gruel at the Northside soup kitchen in Flint. But I'd run out of food stamps if I didn't. Even the Gospel missions, traditionally the refuge of drifters and drunks, are filling up with out-of-work factory hands and their families. "When the money runs out, we have to rely on the mission," says Michael Hartwell after a dinner of mashed potatoes and ham at the Flint Rescue Mission with his wife Lynn and four-year-old son Shawn. "The boy needs to eat and we need to eat. When it's time, it's time."

Hartwell is a Vietnam veteran who took an AK-47 round in his hip, leaving him with a disability severe enough to keep him from working on the assembly lines. Two years ago, he lost his job as a forklift operator and warehouse clerk, and last year his wife was laid off from a 7-11 store. Since, then, they have been surviving on her \$260 monthly benefit check and \$168 in food stamps. They fall into the Catch-22 of unemployment in modern America: they receive too much in benefits to qualify for full welfare, but they're too poor to eat. "Before I'd let Shawn starve or Lynn starve, I'd stick somebody up," swears Hartwell with quiet ferocity. "It's not something I'd be proud to do, but kids don't understand 'recession' and 'depression' and all the big words adults use. They just know their stomach's empty and it hurts."

Pride prevents many of the new unemployed from taking advantage of either public or private assistance. Says Don Thomas, the president of the Steelworkers local in Braddock, "I've had guys say to me, 'You're crazy if you think I'm going to stand there for food . . . Honestly, I don't know what some of these people are going to do.'" Bill Adkisson, the United Auto Workers' liaison with United Way charities in Flint, says he has had to "physically force" laid-

off workers into his car to get them to the food bank. "One guy said to me that if it hadn't been for the Salvation Army, his wife and four kids would not have eaten in the last three or four weeks," Adkisson says. "There are so many others like that, but who are just too pigheaded to ask."

Others take the help but hate it. George Papson swallows hard every time he picks up his unemployment check, recalling the times he looked down on recipients: "I used to say, 'Jesus Christ, look at those guys standing in line for handouts.' I started from scratch. Nobody gave me anything. Now look at me." Jimmy Thomas, laid off two years ago from a \$28,000 job at a trucking terminal, talks of his degrading "dependence" on the poverty bureaucracies, including those that are helping him retrain for a new career as an accountant: "Now I've gone through humiliation just so I can fight my way back onto the tax rolls."

Wounds to the ego can leave physical scars, too. Jimmy Thomas, with nothing to do all day but watch television and sift through bills he is helpless to pay, became a compulsive overeater, out of sheer anxiety. "I'm extremely on edge until 5 p.m.," he says. "That's when I know all the bill collectors have gone home." When the collectors do call at the door, his youthful-looking wife, Donna, has to fend them off: softening her voice, she tells them, no, she is very sorry, but her mother and father are not at home. After two years of this, Jimmy Thomas's body has ballooned up to 309 pounds. He has high blood pressure and last August had a heart attack, though he is only 33. "Some people drink—I don't drink," he says. "Some people use drugs—I don't use drugs. I use food."

Daytime drinking is on the rise throughout the industrial states, and one of the predictable results is an increase in family abuse. "They sit in the tavern all day and then head home to kick the wife and kids around a while," says Don Brook's wife, Diane. "I don't know whether there is more violence, but I do know the severity has increased," adds Jo Sullivan of Range Women's Advocates in Chisholm, Minn. "It's no longer the pushes and shoves and slaps. Now it's the stitches, the wired jaws, the broken ribs."

Unemployment may mean more togetherness than is good for a family. Says Paul Kapsch, the director of the psychiatric-services unit at the Central Mesabi Medical Center in Hibbing, "Now dad's home, making comments about mom's cooking and child-rearing methods and other things he never noticed before. He's feeling inadequate, and if he's like most males, he's having difficulty expressing that." Instead, the housebound husband erupts in anger. "If the husband is home all the time, he can control the car and the phone," says Sullivan. "Women we'd been working with now tell us they can't go out for counseling, they can't meet with support groups and they don't want us to call. They're scared. And I'm sure there are women not even making initial contact with us for the same reason."

EASING THE BURDEN

Even more disturbing in the long run is the resentment and cynicism growing within the next generation. When older children are forced to look for work to help their families scrape by, there is "a great deal of tension," according to Carl Robertson of the Pittsburgh area Christian Family Services. "The kids feel, 'You had your chance, and you took it. Then you blew it. Now I'm being forced to pay for your mistakes.'" Al-

ternatively, many children may respond by lapsing into a permanent hopelessness. "I'm worried that the children will get the idea that life isn't worth living, that they'll be on welfare for the rest of their lives," says Maj. Alvin R. Nelson, coordinator of the Rockford Salvation Army services.

On welfare for the rest of their lives: it is an idea no industrial worker could even have conceived of 20 years ago when American factories were pouring forth an endless stream of finished goods, and you could walk out of a job one day and have your pick of two others the next. There were recessions now and then, of course, but they seemed no more than momentary stumbles in the economy's ever-upward march. Of all the damage this last recession has inflicted on the industrial heartland, none is more worrisome than its undermining of the old optimism, for optimism is a precondition of economic health. Without it, people stop planning, stop saving, stop cooperating with each other. Without it, they tacitly concede defeat in the growing global economic competition.

What could produce a revival of optimism? The recovery now apparently under way will help, though it will not bring many jobs back to the Monongahela Valley or the Mesabi Range. Of the 21,000 workers General Motors is recalling in the coming months, not one will go back on the line in Flint, Mich. Extensive job-retraining programs would also help, giving dislocated workers some hope that they will find new niches in an evolving postindustrial economy. It will not be easy, however; even in Rockford, with its highly skilled, sophisticated work force, Mayor John McNamara says that worker re-education will mean lower standards of living for many and will take at least a generation to complete. Perhaps more helpful would be a retooling of basic industries—by whatever mix of tax and trade policies is necessary—to make them more competitive with their counterparts in Europe and Japan. For national-security reasons alone, the United States probably cannot turn its back on steel and automobiles in the rush toward fashionable high-tech industries.

Most of all, however, it would help if the new unemployed were not conveniently forgotten as the country begins at last to feel the blessings of recovery. An entire generation of workers, those now in their 20s, 30s and 40s, has been at the very least disabled—if not wiped out. They did not do this to themselves; they are victims of outmoded industrial practices and obsolete plants in an era of cheaper foreign products. But they and their fathers before them made the United States the powerful, wealthy nation it is today, and they are owed something. In the short term, they deserve a decent cushion in the inevitably painful transition to a less affluent way of life. In the long term, they deserve no less than their fathers earned: the satisfaction that comes from an honest day's work and an honest day's pay. ●

BORDER ANGEL

HON. E de la GARZA

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DE LA GARZA. Mr. Speaker, when a great human being dies, all

rise to offer their eulogies in recognition of that person's accomplishments and good deeds. Over the months, the sad event recedes from the painful present into memory that dims with the passage of time. But once in every great while there is an exception, and the passing of Frank Ferree of Harlingen, Tex., on March 10 is just such an exception. The tens of thousands of people who benefited from his charity, from his lifelong dedication to volunteer service, will never, never forget. Even before his death at the age of 88, he was known throughout the Rio Grande Valley as the "border angel."

The usual plaudits just do not seem enough here. And in fact, Frank Ferree's life needs no embellishment. It was the perfect example of selflessness; indeed his life was a permanent sketch of love and humane regard. When he moved to the Rio Grande Valley in 1942, he purchased a 20-acre tract of land on Harlingen's north side—but he did not have it for long. He later sold the land and gave the proceeds to the poor. He lived in a shack thereafter. Anyone who had even heard of Frank Ferree knew that he spent his days gathering discarded produce and old bread from area merchants to distribute to the needy. He established and managed from his own home the Volunteer Border Relief Organization to serve as an agency for distribution of food, clothing, and medicine to the poor on both sides of the border. The many service award medals given him by the Mexican Government were in turn sold to have money for the poor—never any for himself. The city of Harlingen erected a monument in 1974 testifying to his works, and twice during his lifetime he was nominated for the Nobel Peace Prize. The Harlingen City Commission, in a final tribute, waived a State law and will allow Frank Ferree to be buried on the site of his home—the shack he loved dearly and from where he managed his work.

In early 1983, the National Center for Citizen Involvement designated Frank Ferree as a recipient of the highest volunteer service award our country can give—the President's Volunteer Action Award. Frank Ferree will never make it to Washington to receive his award on the 12th of April, but in my opinion, after years of association with him and the work I have seen him perform in the 15th Congressional District, this award serves as the last lighted beacon on his magnificent life.

How can we truly understand the effect of such a man? One single human being who contributed every ounce of his daily energy not to the furthering of his own position, but for the homeless and the hungry. I submit there is no way to measure the effect of this man. Frank Ferree's death ends

only his service, but it gives birth to the legend of his life. The incalculable remembrance of what he did and for whom. You cannot measure that. You can only stand back and shake your head in awe.●

INTRODUCTION OF THE FAIR TRADE ACT OF 1983

HON. AUSTIN J. MURPHY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. MURPHY. Mr. Speaker, like the great majority of my colleagues, and I am sure the majority of Americans, I have long believed that our economy and our industries benefit most when economic competition remains free of Government interference. The principles of laissez-faire created an atmosphere in which American hard work and ingenuity propelled us to the forefront of the industrial world. Unfortunately, conditions no longer allow us to continue to sit on the sidelines while our basic industries crumble around us, and our neighbors join the long lines of the unemployed.

Fair trade benefits all, and I know that our Nation would be better off if we were permitted to compete in free markets. However, the world markets are no longer free. Competition is no longer fair, and our Nation can no longer operate under the illusion that it is fair. Many of the industrial countries in the world market are unfairly subsidizing their own companies and helping these companies sell their products in the United States at prices far below the actual costs of production. We can no longer afford to allow this to happen. The 11 million unemployed Americans cannot afford to wait for the administration to seek legal remedies. Our existing trade laws are not working. Changes must be made now.

Mr. Speaker, in excess of 166,000 steelworkers were unemployed at the beginning of this year, and now, when the automakers are preparing for their period of greatest production during the year, there are still more than 135,000 unemployed steelworkers. Another 20,000 are working shortened workweeks. However, we continue to import. There were 1,097,668 tons imported into the United States in January of this year, an increase of 7,000 tons over the previous month. The American Iron and Steel Institute has estimated that each 1 million tons of steel imported into the United States results in the layoff of 5,000 Americans. We cannot allow this to continue. While foreign producers increased their share of our market to over 22 percent in 1982, our domestic producers' rate of production utilization dropped to 47.3 percent. At the

end of 1981, the domestic steel industry was working at 78.3 percent. That is a drop of 40 percent.

I rise today to reintroduce the Fair Trade Act, which has two basic goals. First, the Fair Trade Act establishes a schedule which limits penetration of foreign steel to a level dependent upon the rate of production utilization in the domestic steel industry. This legislation limits imports to 2 percent of the market when the domestic steel industry is operating at less than 60 percent of capacity. When the domestic steel industry is working at 60 to 85 percent of capacity, the quota on imports would be increased to 10 percent. There would be no limit on imports when the domestic steel industry is operating at greater than 85 percent.

Second, the Fair Trade Act would establish the President's Commission on Basic Metals which would bring together representatives of labor and industry, members of the Cabinet and the administration, as well as noted experts in fields such as economics, trade, industrial analysis and planning, and defense who would analyze, and determine the needs of, the basic metals industries. The function of the Commission is to monitor the progress of the industry under the act.

I do not profess to have all of the answers. If the industry is not improving under this legislation, then it would be the duty of the Commission to recommend to the President and the Congress changes that should be made. The Commission would also be asked to propose other actions that could be undertaken to revitalize all of our basic metals industries. As a nation we have the intellectual and physical abilities to turn our economy around. It is essential that we begin to make use of that ability.

We cannot afford to become obsessed with the stereotyped theory of free trade that we all learned in Economics 201. The theory that the country that can most advantageously produce a certain article should do so and those that cannot should import it is an interesting theory if everyone is playing by the rules, but it has become evident that we are the only true sportsmen on the field. While other nations are taking full advantage of our relatively open door, they have kept theirs tightly closed. Of course, Japan is happy to accept our coal, our oil, and our timber because they have none, in turn they expect us to buy their automobiles and steel and many other products which we already have in abundance. One by one they have targeted American industries for destruction. First they must undersell us until no American firm can remain in business. When the last domestic competitor is gone, the Japanese raise their prices, having to compete only with other nations such as Korea, which play the same game. Converse-

ly, with few exceptions, no nation will knowingly permit the importation of any article which will cause one man to lose work for 1 day.

Mr. Speaker, we can no longer afford to be the only true sportsman on the field.●

OZARK NATIONAL SCENIC RIVERWAYS

HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation to amend Public Law 88-492, which established the Ozark National Scenic Riverways.

The original Ozark National Scenic Riverways enabling legislation, enacted in 1964, gave what was then very clear discretion to the Secretary of the Interior to permit activities relating to hunting and fishing on lands and water under his jurisdiction. Within the definition of hunting, the interpretation then and until recently, was that trapping would be allowed with applicable State and Federal laws. However, recent court decisions in different areas of the country have redefined the definition to exclude trapping, even though that sport was allowed since the enactment of Public Law 88-492 until those recent decisions.

My proposal, in brief, will include trapping as an allowable sport within the Ozark National Scenic Riverways area in accordance with applicable State and Federal laws and as the Secretary of the Interior may direct for public safety. This proposal does not change the status quo, but does more clearly define allowable activities in the area and, in light of the recent court decisions, reestablish the congressional intent of Public Law 88-492.●

NATIONAL MENTAL HEALTH WEEK

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Joint Resolution 186, designating the week of April 10, 1983, through April 16, 1983, as "National Mental Health Week."

Mr. Speaker, the costs attributable to mental disorders in our society are staggering in terms of human suffering, direct patient care, and lost productivity. Mental illness cost our Nation an estimated \$65 billion annually and is among the leading factors in rising health care costs and in the

decline of labor productivity. Recent epidemiological studies indicate that in any 1 year, between 31 to 41 million Americans suffer from a clearly diagnosable mental disorder, mostly involving a degree of incapacity that interferes with employment, attendance at school, or independent living. Among children, it is estimated that 12 million Americans under the age of 18 suffer from serious mental disorders, including infantile autism, hyperactivity, and learning disabilities—conditions which interfere with the vital developmental processes essential for normal adult living. The early detection and treatment of mental illness in children and the prevention of psychiatric disabilities produce very large returns in long-term cost-effectiveness and enhanced productivity.

With respect to the elderly, 11 percent of the population is now 65 years of age or older, and their proportion in our population is increasing rapidly. Of these, between 15 and 25 percent have some condition of significant mental impairment, and up to 80 percent of those in nursing homes have such impairment. Treatable depression is often a major component of these problems which are unrecognized or dismissed as an expression of senility. In light of current research activities, depression and impairment of memory in the elderly now lend themselves to the hope of pharmacological treatment.

Persons with mental disorders have been known to be high consumers of medical and surgical services, especially when their conditions are allowed to go untreated. It is estimated that up to 80 percent of all diseases are psychosomatic or stress-related, and mental disabilities account for 30 percent of all hospital admissions.

In light of these alarming statistics, it is regrettable that fear and misunderstanding of mental illnesses still persist in this Nation. The fact is that mental illnesses is a very treatable disability. Recovery from psychiatric disorders is not only possible, but likely on account of major recent breakthroughs in diagnosis and treatment. Two-thirds of all mentally ill patients show significant signs of recovery with initial treatment, and of these one-half will never need treatment again. For example, the introduction of lithium carbonate for the treatment of manic-depressive illnesses has not only helped relieve the suffering of millions of Americans over the past 10 years, but at the same time has resulted in estimated savings in cost of treatment and productivity exceeding \$4 billion. This sum is greater than all the funds ever appropriated by the Congress for research on mental illness.

There is a rapidly growing body of evidence which demonstrates important behavioral and psychological components of such physical disorders

as diabetes, asthma, impotence, myocardial infarction, hypertension, obesity, sleep disorders, and recovery potential from procedures such as open heart surgery and repair of hip fractures in the elderly. Attention to the psychological aspects of these physical disorders can not only play an important role in prevention, but has been shown to reduce dramatically morbidity, the cost of treatment, and lost productivity. A recent study found that a group of 24 elderly patients that had undergone surgery for repair of hip fractures and that had available psychiatric services required an average of 12 days less hospitalization than a similar group of patients that did not have the psychiatric services. This study and others provide compelling evidence of the medical-effectiveness and cost-savings resulting from reduced utilization of general medical services when mental health services are available.

Mental health treatment and research are performed by a wide range of health professionals including psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, nurses, physical and occupational therapists, and mental health counselors. These dedicated professionals perform in a variety of settings which include private psychiatric hospitals, general and community hospitals, nursing homes, alcoholism and drug abuse treatment facilities, State hospitals, community mental health centers and clinics, physicians' offices, and business and industrial work settings. Their collective work has allowed millions of Americans to return to productive and gainful employment. My tenure on the Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee has offered me the opportunity to witness firsthand the tremendous breakthroughs in mental illness research achieved by these dedicated mental health professionals. In fact, a recent Nobel Prize has been awarded to a grantee of the National Institute of Mental Health.

I hope that my colleagues will join me in supporting this joint resolution focusing national attention on the severity of mental illness in America and in recognizing the efforts and accomplishments of the dedicated mental health providers. I urge the House to act swiftly. ●

TRIBUTE TO AUDREY BECK— CONNECTICUT STATE SENATOR

HON. NANCY L. JOHNSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mrs. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness that I stand here today to pay tribute to Audrey Beck, a

fine human being, an outstanding State senator, and a friend.

I admired Audrey and always valued the opportunity to work with her. Principled, intelligent, deeply caring; she was an effective legislator. Her ability to understand the nature of people's lives and of our laws enabled her to forcefully advocate those causes she perceived as creating opportunity, ameliorating suffering, and strengthening our society.

Those of us from Connecticut who have worked with Audrey will miss her. I stand here today in recognition of her outstanding service to the citizens of the State of Connecticut through her effective participation in the endless intricacies of the senate and legislative process. We honor her as an outstanding State senator. We honor her as a compassionate person. We honor her for her intellectual capacity. We honor her as a great woman who gave generously to us all. ●

THE GIRL SCOUTS FOUND A NEW WORLD

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Girl Scouts of the United States of America celebrates its 71st anniversary this week with the new national theme—"We Found a New World." This is a fitting theme for an organization which is devoted to the development of young women throughout this country. Through a program which combines self-discovery with an appreciation of nature, the arts, and friendship; Girl Scouting has helped girls grow into mature young women.

Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. is the largest voluntary organization for girls in the world with over 44 million girls, women, and men involved in the organization since 1912. Today there are over 2 million girls in the four Girl Scouts programs. These girls are a part of the "new world" of Girl Scouting.

Over the past 71 years this program has been able to adapt with the changes in our society and its attitudes about women. Through its informal education program four areas of contemporary concern are highlighted. These areas are nonstereotyped career education, the sciences, sports for women, and mainstreaming the disabled. Each of these areas reflects the concerns of women in today's world.

While the theme and activities of Girl Scouting have changed over the years, the spirit and goals of the program have not. Those involved in this program remain committed to developing the full potential of each Girl

Scout. In the course of this development a girl makes friends, becomes more aware of her physical and social surroundings, and begins to play a role in the affairs of her community.

Last year, as the Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. celebrated their 70th birthday, Girl Scouts across the country announced that they would make a special gift of service to their home communities. In Tennessee, Tiffany Huff and Rhonda Dunlap of the Tanasi Girl Scout Council helped clean the Fort Loudon Lake which runs through Knoxville and the site of the recent World's Fair. They helped make it a pleasant recreation site for visitors. In addition, Becky Newport and Kristi Melton participated in day camp programs and activities that had the gift of water theme. Becky's camp undertook a project to clean a creek bank used by picnickers; Kristi's camp held a 2-week session called water is wonderful, in which Brownie, Junior, and Cadette Girl Scouts learned about the importance of water.

These Girl Scouts are participating in the events here in Washington to celebrate the 71st birthday anniversary. I believe we should congratulate them, and Girl Scouts of the U.S.A. on their achievements and on having "found a new world."

**AL LOWENSTEIN: OUR TRIUMPH,
OUR TRAGEDY**

HON. BARNEY FRANK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. FRANK. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, there will be a symposium in the House Office Buildings conducted by the Friends of Al Lowenstein, a former Member of this body whose death 3 years ago deprived this country of one of its most creative and valuable citizens.

For those of us who had the privilege of knowing Al, it will be a bitter-sweet time—a time to cherish our memories of one of the most inspiring, stimulating, and delightful people we have ever known; and a time to rededicate ourselves to the kind of passionate effort to make this a better world which was his hallmark. I hope the many people in Washington whose lives he touched will join us this weekend. And I would like at this point to share with the Members one of the articles written at the time of his death by another important American social activist, Michael Harrington, in the *Village Voice*, March 24, 1980. I want to add Mr. Speaker that it is particularly appropriate that some of us are commemorating Al on the day the House votes on the nuclear freeze, for this is exactly the sort of mobilization of millions of Americans on behalf of

an important cause which was the activity at which Al Lowenstein excelled. A lot of us miss him very much.

**AL LOWENSTEIN: OUR TRIUMPH, OUR
TRAGEDY**

(By Michael Harrington)

Al Lowenstein was murdered last week. He was a member of a tiny generation of the left that joined the movement in the first period after World War II. If there is an historical key to his utterly unique personality, it is there.

All of us—which is to say, the happy few—who became activists in that conformist decade had to be slightly crazy, utterly optimistic, and filled with a deep faith in the country we criticized so radically. (If not, why become involved in a seemingly hopeless struggle in those years of cold war, McCarthyism, and Eisenhower somnolence?) Al had more of those qualities than any of us. He was one of our rare triumphs and at the same time the very incarnation of our tragedy.

Al Lowenstein thirsted after justice and peace and equality with an unflagging passion, yet he was not a political saint. He was a complex human being whose driving intensity was sometimes almost frantic, who often inspired love and sometimes provoked anger. He was perpetually at the center of some struggle or a controversy. You never knew where you would meet him next. An incident might evoke his mercurial, irrepressible spirit. In 1971, the East Pakistanis were battling for the creation of Bangla Desh. The Indians had called an international meeting of solidarity with them. I was sitting in the Gandhi Center in New Delhi when Al appeared. He handed me a Christmas card he had written in a helicopter over Saigon the previous December—it was now September—and apologized for being late with the season's greetings.

It will take at least a book to capture his life. Let me simply remember a few of its moments.

I first met Al at his alma mater, the University of North Carolina. It was at the home of Ann Queen, the director of the Young Women's Christian Association, which was then, bizarre as it may seem, the most effective antiestablishment organization in the Old Confederacy. I was pontificating about the bourgeois vices of the National Student Association and no one told me that the young man to whom I had just been introduced was one of its leading figures. Under the inspiration of Eleanor Roosevelt and that luminous North Carolinian, Frank Graham, Al and a few integrationists on southern campuses were helping to turn the careerist sandbox of student government into an instrument of struggle for black equality. It was an absurd idea and it worked, for a while at least.

The NSA had adopted a pro-civil rights position by 1958 and came out against the House Un-American Activities Committee in 1961, and Al was a major reason why. Long after he had left the organization's formal leadership, he kept organizing students, agitating on issues, and lobbying at its conventions. That provided a framework for the surge of student commitment in the '60s (and for the rise of SDS). By then, Al was engaged in an even more innovative project. He went down to Mississippi in 1963 and along with Bob Moses and Aaron Henry helped to organize the Mississippi Freedom Democratic Party. If the racists denied blacks the right to vote in that state, he said, then we will hold our own, unofficial

elections to dramatize that crime. He brought another one of his heroes, Norman Thomas, down to Mississippi and they went out to the boondocks—the New York Jew and the socialist who started as a Protestant minister—where they were quite literally pursued on lonely roads by the Klan. Out of that 1963 effort came the MFDP challenge to the regular Mississippi delegation to the national Democratic convention in 1964, which was a major step toward the internal transformation of the Democratic Party.

Not atypically, this extraordinary accomplishment led to shrill accusations against one of its principal authors. At the 1964 convention there were differences within the movement over how to conduct the floor fight and, in keeping with the fratricidal spirit then developing, those who were seen as moderates were denounced as traitors, worse than honest open racists. Al felt that the movement had to be as broad as possible and oriented toward progressive unionists and other mainstream forces, that it should avoid leftwing factionalizing. Not too long after the split, I was at a private meeting where Al confronted three of his severest critics and shredded the charges against him. Someone less committed might have been demoralized when slandered after risking his life in a profound service to the movement. Al, of course, was not. As the old, integrationist civil rights movement collapsed and the black power movement grew, whites like Al and myself found it impossible to work on the old basis, but we continued working with Dr. Martin Luther King until his death in 1968.

Al never stopped. He was soon organizing against Vietnam. He had been an internationalist from the very start. When I first knew him he was involved with the South African resistance and the anti-Franco underground in Spain. Then, with Gene McCarthy's campaign in 1968 and Bobby Kennedy's run, Al helped create a political antiwar movement which built on the teach-ins and protests and took them into the electoral mainstream. That story is familiar enough. I would rather remember two incidents from the late '60s and early '70s which get to one of the deep truths about the man. One night in 1969, Al had organized an antiwar rally at a shopping-center parking lot on Long Island, and we were jeered and threatened by an angry crowd of hawks. A few years later, when Al was running against impossible odds to win back the Long Island congressional seat that had been gerrymandered out from under him, he told me how he sought out community meetings where those very hawks would predominate. He believed that if he could talk to them long enough, he could convince them. Of course, that was ridiculous. But then, so was attempting to unseat an incumbent president of the United States. That is the point. Al Lowenstein believed in the basic decency of this country in spite of a firsthand knowledge of its ugliness. In America, there is a left based upon love and solidarity and, if you strip the word of all chauvinism and parochialism, there is a left based on hatred alone. Al was of that first left, which might some day lead masses of people because it really believes in the people. And he led them—but only for a fleeting moment. And that is the tragedy.

This country tolerated Al Lowenstein only as long as he was on the move, only gave him a real place to stand for those two short years in Congress. So his life was, until its terrible end, and infinity of campaigns and causes of more defeats than victories. A

lover of argument and logic, he was utterly unreasonable in his commitment which helped make this country just a bit more rational.

In a part of Africa, everyone born in a certain year has a special relationship to everyone else born that year. So with us from the '50s. There were so few of us on the left, we all knew one another. Sometimes we drifted apart, sometimes we differed on this or that question. But we participated in the brotherhood and sisterhood of a generation that came of age in a time when one struggled in the name of hope or else did not even begin the fight. Al Lowenstein was a complex, irreplaceable individual who cannot be reduced to a moment in history. He was one of the very finest representatives of a special generation.●

CALL TO CONSCIENCE

HON. WILLIS D. GRADISON, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. GRADISON. Mr. Speaker, the Call to Conscience Vigil continues in 1983 on behalf of the Soviet Jews who are being detained in the U.S.S.R. and denied their basic human rights. In light of the decline in the level of Soviet Jewish emigration—only 204 Jews were allowed to emigrate in the first 2 months of 1983—and the steady Soviet repression of the Jewish culture and way of life, we must redouble our efforts to help these people to gain their freedom.

Unfortunately, I must today bring to my colleagues' attention, as I have done for the past 2 years, the plight of the Igor Guberman family. This statement, in fact, is timed to the third anniversary of Mr. Guberman's sentence to internal "conditional" exile in Borodino, Siberia, after his conviction in March 1980 for dealing in stolen icons. Many of those who have been following his case believe that his conviction was a pretext which the Soviet authorities have used to halt his previous active efforts on behalf of the rights of Soviet Jews.

Mr. Guberman, his wife Tatyana, and his son Emil, have managed to rent a small house and to maintain a productive vegetable garden. They also receive monthly food packages sent from the United States. Since my statement last year, his daughter Tanya, has returned to Moscow to live with her grandmother so that she can go to school. While life in exile is certainly better than life in prison, the uncertainty of Mr. Guberman's "conditional" exile is a considerable psychological burden. At any time, local Soviet authorities can find him guilty of breaking a law and put him back into prison.

The Gubermans' troubles started when they first applied for an exit visa to Israel in 1978. While Mr. Guberman plans to reapply when he is released from exile, which is expected to be in

August 1984, his chances to emigrate will be very slim. Even after his release, there will be little or no reason for the Soviet authorities to allow him or his family to leave. Therefore, we must do all that we can to raise the issue of Mr. Guberman's situation with the Soviets now. We cannot allow them to forget his plight or to ignore our interest.

Regrettably, Mr. Guberman's situation is representative of the situations of many of the Soviet Jews who are being punished for having expressed a desire to exercise their most basic human rights: the right to religious freedom and the right to emigrate. Consequently, they have turned to the administration and the Congress as their only hope and lifeline to these freedoms. We have consistently spoken out against Soviet abuses of the fundamental rights of their people and have made it known the strong interest in such cases. Despite the lack of response of the Soviet officials, or perhaps I should say, because of that lack of response, we should strengthen our resolve to fight for the Soviet Jews' rights in general and specifically for their right to emigrate. Let us heed this "Call to Conscience" and hope that another vigil for freedom will not be necessary before Igor Guberman and his family are permitted to emigrate to Israel.●

A BILL TO REPEAL THE NEW TAX LAW

HON. DANIEL K. AKAKA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. AKAKA. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing a measure to repeal the new tax law that allows the Internal Revenue Service to withhold interest and dividends at the source of the interest or dividend earned. Last year when the conference report on the Tax Equity and Fairness Act (TEFRA) was presented to the House for consideration, we were faced with a bill containing many provisions which had not been given fair and open consideration. In fact, no hearings were held and there was no discussion of the issues on the floor. The withholding provision was a provision added by the other body at the last minute. This hasty decision has proved to be a very unpopular one with thousands of the people we represent. Now is the time to repeal this ill-advised provision.

I have been convinced by the many constituents who have spoken up on withholding that the provision must be repealed at once. I need not repeat the many salient facts supporting repeal of withholding interest and dividends at the source. Suffice it to say that this provision is burdensome

and likely to cost more than it will, in fact, deliver to the Government in revenues.

In order to make sure that the IRS has sufficient power to enforce the law taxing interest and dividends, I have included in this bill sections providing for easier matching of 1999 forms with individual income tax returns. Enactment of these sections will confirm IRS authority to extend the matching process already in operation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in seeing that this hastily approved withholding provision is repealed.●

**LET US NOT TURN BACK AND
TURN OUR BACKS ON U.S.
TAXPAYERS—INDEXING IS
NOT ONLY FAIR, IT IS NEEDED**

HON. GUY VANDER JAGT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. VANDER JAGT. Mr. Speaker, there has been some strong comments that indexing of income tax brackets, scheduled to take effect in 1985, may be repealed. I trust that will eventually prove to be the heart of the matter—simply comments and talk. I know I do not have to recite here inflation's impact on income tax brackets. We have witnessed it for years as inflation—not real earnings—pushed individual taxpayers into higher tax brackets. They end up paying more for less.

Tax indexation was a fair and decent approach to eliminate a most unfair and unreasonable inflationary action.

But, if there are really serious efforts to repeal the tax indexation law, I strongly recommend to those Members considering such action to read with care a recent editorial in the Muskegon Chronicle newspaper, Muskegon, Mich. It is an excellent editorial on the subject of indexing entitled "Soaking the Poor."

Let me cite especially one paragraph in that editorial which, undoubtedly, led to its headline. That paragraph read:

Further, if indexing is repealed, the 1984 income tax liability for people with incomes of less than \$10,000 would increase by 9.4 percent. But for persons with incomes between \$100,000 and \$200,000 the increase is only 1.7 percent. Some Robin Hoods.

The complete editorial follows:

[From the Muskegon (Mich.) Chronicle,
Mar. 6, 1983]

AS WE SEE IT: SOAKING THE POOR

The sign should read "Warning: Tax Spenders at Work."

We're here to warn our reader-taxpayers today that with a reluctant bow of suffering in accepting a key part of President Reagan's economic recovery plan—the third phase of the tax cut (10 percent) scheduled for next July—the Democratic czar of the

tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, Dan Rostenkowski, is plotting to render the cut meaningless.

He's mapped a callous switcheroo designed to fuel new spending at the expense, largely, of low-income taxpayers.

He said last week he didn't think he had the votes to kill the tax cut, and wasn't going to bother even to try—an announcement that stunned colleagues who know there's nothing he'd like better than to pull the plug on that Reagan engine of recovery.

But before you conclude that Rostenkowski really meant he'd allow people to keep more of what they earned, grab your wallets and hold tight as, predictably, the "means" man hunts a "way" through the taxpayers' back door to do what was politically too risky to do out front.

What he found (more accurately, rediscovered) was a neatly hidden way to increase your taxes while removing any real budget-cutting incentive to reduce spending. Politicians don't like to be seen raising taxes to fuel more congressional spending, so they latched onto a way to let inflation do it for them.

They've been using it with a vengeance for years. We trust most of our readers are familiar with it. It's called "bracket creep." It cost them a huge bundle through the free-spending 1970s. It costs them dearly even now, and allowing it to continue would be disastrous.

Reagan pledged to halt it by what is called "tax indexing," and back in 1981 Republicans and conservative Democrats joined in voting to index income taxes, hailing the vote as the "first major break for taxpayers in the last 50 years." That's not far off the mark. Martin Feldstein, chairman of President Reagan's Council of Economic Advisors, terms it "the most fundamental and far-reaching aspect of Ronald Reagan's tax program."

Under the law, indexing is to start in 1985. Rostenkowski and his congressional minions want it repealed—now. The deal will be to lay off the July tax cut in return for dumping indexation. We should all of us—every wage earner, and especially those in the lower brackets—shout "NO!" No commutation of that deserved death sentence. * * *

"BRACKET CREEP" MUST GO

We've explained bracket creep and its specific cure, indexing, several times in this space. Because it affects the entire economy, instead of policies that affect a segment of the population (often inducing intense lobbying activity), the indexing issue hasn't exerted much pressure on Congress.

But experience shows, at the very least, we can count on vigorous response from the Chronicle's inveterate letterwriters. Briefly, here's why indexing is so important. As things now stand, inflation pushes people into higher tax brackets, even though taxpayers' higher nominal earnings represent no real gain in purchasing power, because costs rise with increases in income.

That's bracket creep. It's an "inflation dividend" that provides an easy source of revenue for Congress. It removes for congressmen the acute political discomfort of actually voting for tax increases, because inflation sneakily does the job for them. Indexing will stop this. Tax brackets will be adjusted to reflect the impact of inflation on taxpayers' incomes.

One of the worst effects of bracket creep is that it comes down hardest on those who can least afford it—the poor people the Rostenkowskis, "Tip" O'Neills and their ilk ostensibly are out to defend. These are. * * *

CHAMPIONS OF THE POOR?

*** Deliver us! The repeal of indexing is a hidden way of rising taxes. And if indexing is repealed, tax increases would sting the lowest income taxpayers the most. Tax brackets are narrowest at the lower end of the income scale, and so inflation drives those with low incomes into higher brackets much more quickly than it does those in the higher categories. The really affluent can't be pushed by inflation into paying any higher tax rate because they already pay the highest rate (50 percent).

Further, if indexing is repealed, the 1984 income tax liability for people with incomes of less than \$10,000 would increase by 9.4 percent. But for persons with incomes between \$100,000 and \$200,000 the increase is only 1.7 percent. Some Robin Hoods!

Rostenkowski's argument that repeal of indexing is necessary to fight mounting budget deficits is absurd on the face of it. The tax take soared as a result of the inflation of the 1970s, and the budget got further and further out of balance. As Reagan points out, government realizes 1.5 percent more in revenue for every 1 percentage point increase in inflation. The more revenue it gets the more government is going to grow—and the more Congress has to woo special interests and bankroll new programs and pet projects.

Write your congressmen. Hold onto indexing. No repeal. No postponements. As Mr. Feldstein stresses, it is critically important to start indexing on time in 1985, "because once American taxpayers experience indexing it will be here to stay. ●"

TURKISH AMBASSADOR DISCUSSES VIEWS OF TURKEY CONCERNING CYPRUS CRISIS

HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, on February 7, 1983, I introduced House Joint Resolution 128, a resolution with respect to conventional arms transfer limitations.

In the course of my introductory statement, I made reference to the Turkish withdrawal of permission for U.S. use of bases in Turkey when the United States imposed an arms embargo on Turkey in order to encourage the removal of Turkish troops on Cyprus. Mr. Sukru Elekdag, the Ambassador of the Turkish Republic, wrote a letter to me in which he explained the Turkish view of these developments.

As a courtesy to the Turkish Ambassador and for the benefits of my colleagues, the full text of Ambassador Elekdag's letter follows:

TURKISH EMBASSY,

Washington, D.C., February 17, 1983.

HON. TONY HALL,

U.S. House of Representatives, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I have read your statement and the bill on the conventional arms transfer limitations which appeared in the Congressional Record of February 7, 1983.

As your statement on some occasions relates to Turkey, I have taken the liberty of writing to you so as to explain our views in so far as Turkey has been mentioned.

As you cite, in 1975 after the Congress imposed an arms embargo on Turkey, the facilities accorded to the U.S. were withdrawn. When, the then Greek Government, engineered a coup in Cyprus, Turkey using her right in accordance with the international agreements that gave birth to Cyprus, dispatched its troops so as to safeguard her compatriots. The arms embargo was thus considered by the Turkish people and Government as an unjustifiable and hostile act, a treatment which the United States has not deemed appropriate even for its adversaries.

First of all, we had no alternative but dispatch our troops, after having exhausted on the diplomatic front all possible avenues. When the embargo was imposed, again, after having waited for some time for its removal, we were left with no choice but to withdraw the facilities except those relating directly to NATO. The Turkish action was justified on the legal grounds that the U.S. had unilaterally violated her contractual obligations toward Turkey.

I would hope that you would understand the reasons under which on the two occasions Turkey had to act.

Fortunately these distressing experiences of the past have ceased to affect the relations and cooperation between our countries. As a matter of fact, presently, we are happy to observe that Turkish-American ties and alliance cohesiveness are continuing to grow into a marvelous and unified relationship. And I should add that the solid ties and efficient cooperation between Turkey and the United States do not only serve and further our respective country's interests but also substantially contribute to the regional as well as global peace and stability.

I would respectfully ask of you, Mr. Congressman, to insert my letter, should you deem it fit, in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

SUKRU ELEKDAG,
Ambassador of the Turkish Republic. ●

THE SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH ACT OF 1983

HON. HANK BROWN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Scientific Research Act of 1983. The bill would amend section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to facilitate and to simplify the use of debt financing by this Nation's institutions of higher education to acquire much-needed scientific research equipment and facilities.

While debt financing is available now, it requires the manipulation of many different kinds of financial instruments, the cooperation of an investment banker to sell unrated paper, and the expensive advice of tax counsel. The complexities of the Tax Code, and innumerable IRS regulations, dis-

courage many university administrators from going forward with an equipment-financing program. This bill would merely simplify what is being done at the present time. It will keep our Nation on the cutting edge of high technology and help train current and future generations of scientists and engineers.

We are all acutely aware of the challenge facing this country as we strive to maintain the technological creativity and inventiveness that is so critical to the well-being of our industry and national security. As we move toward the 21st century, we find ourselves threatened by the steady erosion of the technological strength which we have often taken for granted, as allies and foes alike forge ahead in the development of new technologies and the world markets which are opening for their products.

In meeting this challenge, we must look to our colleges and universities, our institutions of higher learning, for new capabilities and ideas and for another generation of scientists, engineers, and technicians to lead us toward technological progress, to provide new jobs and industrial innovation. The research laboratories and classrooms are the foundries in which the technology of the future will be forged. Yet we find ourselves often neglecting the pressing needs of these institutions.

In his recent appearance before the Subcommittee on Science Research and Technology, Dr. George G. Olson, vice president for research at Colorado State University, succinctly described the direct relationship between this country's declining leadership in high technology and the obsolescence of the scientific facilities and equipment in our institutions of higher learning. But Dr. Olson is no Cassandra. He does not just decry the problems; he proposes solutions to them. He has personally pioneered new avenues of financing at his own institution that should serve as a model for other university and college administrators.

The bill I am introducing today should entail no revenue loss, but would make the financing techniques now permitted under our tax laws less cumbersome and more creative. I am inserting a copy of Dr. Olson's statement in the *RECORD* at the conclusion of my remarks so my colleagues will have the benefit of Dr. Olson's assessment of the problems facing our schools and the one simple action that we can take to make his task, and that of his fellow scientific researchers, easier.

This one action, the enactment of this bill, will provide many benefits. It will upgrade the university laboratories. It will improve the university environment, permitting our campuses to retain and attract the best faculty and graduate students possible in the

fields of science and engineering. We will, thereby, assure another generation of scientific leadership to maintain and enhance this Nation's technological preeminence.

The late great baseball player Satchel Paige once wisely admonished, "Never look back; someone may be gaining on you." People are gaining on us; we need not look back but it is high time we look ahead and take actions necessary to preserve our technological lead. I urge my colleagues to support this bill and hope it will receive prompt consideration by the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the text of Dr. Olson's testimony:

STATEMENT OF DR. GEORGE G. OLSON, VICE PRESIDENT FOR RESEARCH, COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, the direct relation between this country's declining leadership in high technology and the obsolescence of our university scientific equipment has been well established in the recent book published by Harper and Row, "Global Stakes, The Future of High Technology in America".

Traditionally, the solution to the problem of equipment acquisition has come as outright grants from university budgets, state appropriations, endowment funds, corporate gifts or the federal government. These sources at best are irregular, inadequate and in times of severe budget constraints, improbable.

Isn't it time we helped ourselves? It is estimated that universities will conduct \$6 billion of research activity this year funded from both public and private sources. Let us suppose that we need at least \$1 billion in new equipment to start the rehabilitation of our university laboratories. Why not finance it? One billion dollars of new equipment financed at 10% over the next five years would cost us \$264 million per year or just 4.4% of our total budget. We learned last year at the National Research Council Workshop on Revitalizing Laboratory Instrumentation that the ratio of capital expenditures to operating budgets in industrial research laboratories was about 9%. We are talking about less than half that amount over the next five years to provide us \$1 billion in new equipment now. Obviously, if we only wanted to acquire \$250 million in new equipment under the same terms, our debt service would be only one-fourth as much, or barely 1% of our total expenditures for research.

Universities can and must adopt a businesslike approach to equipment financing in order to provide constant upgrading of their facilities on a regular, planned basis. The free enterprise system has developed the mechanisms to address this problem. Simply stated, we need to establish our objectives for research, assess our needs to achieve those objectives, evaluate our fiscal resources, plan our cash management, conduct a risk assessment and, if warranted, undertake debt financing to achieve our objectives. Unlike their counterparts in business, universities have available to them many more mechanisms for debt financing that are under more favorable, tax-exempt terms. These include revenue bonds, industrial development bonds, municipal leases, and tax-exempt lines of credit.

The debt financing of scientific equipment provides other benefits beyond just the acquisition of hardware.

First. It provides equipment now, when it is needed. Scientific progress is not delayed while waiting for an equipment grant that may or may not arrive and when it does, only provides for half the needed funds. Tax-exempt interest rates are generally lower than the inflation rate on equipment, so besides obtaining equipment now, and including interests costs, it is never going to be cheaper.

Second. Debt financing encourages better management on the part of the university administration. When asked to undertake a debt financing program, administrators develop an awareness and interest in the research program and actively participate in its planning and growth.

Third. Debt financing results in improved equipment utilization. When a professor struggles to get a grant for a piece of equipment for his laboratory, it is his and it ought to be. He may or may not share it. However, debt service on equipment generally comes from a number of sources, and shared use means lower costs and it becomes the preferred mode of operation. Debt financing also assures constant upgrading of equipment and its planned replacement.

Fourth. Debt financing develops diversified funding support for equipment. Debt service is met by user charges for the equipment. That means that all agencies, public and private, supporting research utilizing a particular piece of equipment, share in the cost of that equipment—not just the National Science Foundation.

You may question why go to all the trouble of debt financing when it would be so much simpler just to lease a piece of equipment. Certainly leasing should always be investigated and if it is less expensive, it should be considered. However, there are still some advantages to debt financing. Unlike industry, where prudent judgment may allow a new piece of equipment to lose money the first year, break even the second, and contribute to profits the third, universities must generate debt service from the first day equipment is acquired. On major pieces of equipment, debt financing can be structured so that the first year's debt service is capitalized and actual payments are not required until the second year. This gives the laboratory time to "shake down" the equipment, develop a user base, and overcome low utilization at first.

Can debt financing work? It has at Colorado State University where about \$40 million in scientific equipment and facilities have been provided through the debt financing activities of the Colorado State University Research Foundation (CSURF). The mechanisms CSURF has used and some of the facilities financed are summarized here:

Revenue Bonds—Issued on behalf of the university have provided: a laboratory for disease control, a 200 acre research farm, an irrigation system, a CDC 6400 computer.

Industrial Development Bonds—Issued by the appropriate city or county for CSURF have provided: \$6.6 million research service building, a \$9 million Cray-I computer which we lease to the National Center for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, a pending issue for a Cyber 205 supercomputer for our National Supercomputer Network.

Municipal Leases-Purchase Contracts—This method of financing has been used to provide innumerable pieces of equipment costing between \$100,000 and \$1 million.

These have included a satellite tracking station, a computer operating system, VAX and other mini-computers, aircraft, word processing systems, electron microscopes, X-ray equipment, radiation counters, etc.

Tax-exempt Revolving Lines of Credit—CSURF maintains two revolving lines of credit at local banks which are used to buy small pieces of equipment costing from a few thousand dollars to \$100,000. This equipment is the stock in trade of the individual researcher. It is generally leased directly to a project on rather short amortization schedules. This fund turns over constantly to provide CSU researchers a readily available source of small equipment.

Obviously, once you have borrowed money to finance equipment, it must be repaid. This is generally accomplished through "user fees" paid by research projects for use of the equipment. User fees always include the basic principal and interest payments for acquiring the instrument and may include such other expenses as maintenance, operators, etc. Until the recent amendment to OMB Circular A-21, interest on equipment financing was not allowable unless the instrument was leased from an arms-length agency. This was one of the reasons we have used an affiliated, but arms-length organization, the CSU Research Foundation, to manage our debt financing.

Can debt financing of scientific equipment have a major impact on the recovery of high technology leadership in this country? I believe it can and will use the acquisition of supercomputers as an example.

One of the basic requirements today for state-of-the-art capability in most fields of high technology is access to advanced computers. The decline of American preeminence in many fields of academic research can be directly related to the lack of availability of state-of-the-art computers on university campuses. For example, no American university ever acquired a CDC 7600 computer although it was the top scientific computer from the time it was introduced in 1966 until the advent of the supercomputer in 1977. Yet, during that time, a number of universities in Europe acquired CDC 7600 computers and a number of them have already acquired the current state-of-the-art supercomputer, either a Cray-I or a Cyber 205. The fact that these computers are not available to American university researchers not only limits the quality of their research, but means that they are not training graduate students in writing modern codes, they are not exploring new computational methods and are actually falling behind their counterparts in Western Europe and Japan in the basic elements of computer science.

The capital cost of a supercomputer facility is in the range of \$7 to \$10 million depending on the size of computer memory, ancillary equipment, power sources, etc. It is costs of this order of magnitude that have prevented universities from acquiring state-of-the-art scientific computers for the past 16 or 17 years. It is not likely that such funds will become available from federal sources for scientific equipment acquisitions.

Colorado State University, through its Research Foundation, has addressed this national problem in the following ways: In 1977 it acquired a Cray-I computer and leases it to the National Center for Atmospheric Research for the support of their research program. In 1982, the CSU Research Foundation installed a two million word, two vector pipeline Cyber 205 supercomputer in the computer center at Colorado

State University. The Foundation proposes to make this facility available to the university community through a national computer network utilizing selected regional universities as nodes or regional network centers. Last month, the first of these nodes or centers was established at the University of Massachusetts and serves New England through the Dartmouth Kiewit Network.

We believe that equipment acquisition and financing ought to be the responsibility of the university. It is the responsibility of the Congress to support basic research through appropriations to the National Science Foundation and other agencies. Basic research budgets should include an adequate allowance for use charges for state-of-the-art scientific equipment. Once universities begin to manage their own equipment acquisitions on a businesslike basis, they will be continually upgrading their scientific equipment in response to demands from the growth and development of their own research programs.

I would like to close with a practical comment and a request for assistance from this subcommittee. Debt financing is not easy. It requires the manipulation of many different kinds of financial instruments, the cooperation of an investment banker to sell unrated "story bonds" or paper, and finally, the careful and expensive opining of tax counsel. The requirements of OMB Circular A-21, the complexities of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 as amended, and innumerable IRS regulations discourage many university administrators from going forward with an equipment financing program.

This whole complex business could be greatly simplified by your enacting legislation which would amend Section 103 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to provide the following:

"Interest on the obligations of colleges, universities, and not-for-profit organizations for the acquisition of equipment and facilities for scientific or educational purposes shall be tax-exempt."

Such a bill would have no negative impact on tax revenues as it would merely simplify what can be done at the present time. It would, however, stimulate the financing of scientific equipment by universities which will enhance their ability to contribute to the resurgence of America's technical leadership.

A TRIBUTE TO MR. HERBERT M. JACOBOWITZ

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● **Mr. ACKERMAN.** Mr. Speaker, it is with distinct pleasure that I bring the accomplishments of Mr. Herbert M. Jacobowitz to the attention of my colleagues. Mr. Jacobowitz is being honored on Saturday, March 19, 1983, for his many years of dedicated service to the Knights of Pythias—a national fraternal organization.

Herb Jacobowitz is currently the deputy grand chancellor for the Knights of Pythias in the 52d District of New York State. In the past 3 years, he has also served as its president, vice president, and secretary. He was also

the chancellor commander of the Pomonok Lodge of the 52d district.

Through the selfless and unceasing efforts of Herb Jacobowitz and his Pythian brothers, each year 1,000 underprivileged children have an opportunity to leave the hot and crowded city for summer camp. Because of the efforts of people like Herb, working through the charitable offices of the Knights of Pythias, the burdens of the aged and the handicapped are lessened.

Herb Jacobowitz truly exemplifies the motto of the Knights of Pythias: "Friendship, Charity, and Benevolence." The Pomonok Lodge could not have chosen a finer person to honor at its testimonial dinner.

I am proud to praise Herbert Jacobowitz and his distinguished record of service. He is, indeed, a remarkable American, and I know we all wish him the best of luck in his future endeavors. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to bring Herb Jacobowitz's achievements to the attention of this body. ●

FOREIGN TRADE PRACTICES: A NEW APPROACH

HON. DAN MICA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● **Mr. MICA.** Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation—the Foreign Trade Practices Act of 1983—that would establish certain restrictions on payments to foreign government officials in the course of export trade, and would direct the executive branch to undertake negotiation of an international agreement governing business payments to foreign officials. The restrictions I am proposing in this bill would be added to the existing responsibilities and authorities of the Secretary of Commerce to regulate and control export trade under the Export Administration Act of 1979. They would be similar to those now contained in the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, but would incorporate most of the changes proposed by S. 414, a bill passed by the Senate in the last Congress and introduced in this Congress by Senator HEINZ and others. Those changes are designed to clarify actions that are prohibited and to give greater weight to foreign standards of business propriety.

If enacted, Mr. Speaker, this legislation would require repeal of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act, replacing it with similar provisions in the Export Administration Act. Responsibility for its administration and enforcement would be transferred from the Securities and Exchange Commission to the Department of Commerce. I believe such a new approach to the

regulation of foreign trade practices with respect to payments to foreign government officials is essential for several reasons.

First, existing restrictions have had a major impact on the reliability and competitiveness of U.S. exporters and export trade. As essentially a domestic regulatory agency whose primary mission is to protect U.S. corporate stockholders, the Securities and Exchange Commission is not in a good position to weigh the foreign trade and broad economic implications of restrictions on foreign trade practices. I believe the Department of Commerce is a more appropriate administering and enforcement agency with respect to such practices, having as it does existing broad responsibility and analytic capability for both domestic and foreign trade and economic policy. It is in that kind of broader context that restrictions on the practices of U.S. firms in foreign trade should be formulated, monitored, and enforced.

The Department already enforces restrictions on the compliance of U.S. firms with foreign economic boycotts directed against countries friendly to the United States—the so-called Anti-Boycott Act contained in section 8 of the Export Administration Act. It has enforced those restrictions aggressively and effectively, but with due regard for the great employment and other benefits that flow from exports, and for the need of the United States to remain competitive in world markets. I believe the Commerce Department could similarly enforce reasonable restrictions on payments to foreign government officials in the course of foreign trade without imposing excessive burdens on American companies or giving up major foreign markets to our competitors.

Of course, the restrictions themselves on payments to foreign officials must be reasonable and flexible to avoid becoming counterproductive, and that is the second major group of proposals contained in the bill I am introducing today. The Foreign Corrupt Practices Act has, I believe, gone somewhat too far in restricting trade practices, and caused needless and unjust loss of U.S. exports both for that reason and because some of its provisions are unclear. The very name of the act itself has a chilling effect on trade, and I therefore proposed to change it to a more neutral one—the Foreign Trade Practices Act of 1983. As a result of imprecise language in the existing act, exporters have been forced to forgo potentially lucrative and often perfectly legitimate export opportunities simply because they could not reasonably determine whether any improprieties might be involved that could be considered violations of U.S. law.

In establishing restrictions on payments to foreign officials under the

Export Administration Act, Mr. Speaker, my proposal would make several significant clarifications and changes in existing restrictions. It would, for example, exempt from the prohibitions any payment to a foreign government official that was permissible under the laws, regulations, or policies of that government. That exemption is similar to one already contained in the antiboycott law which allows U.S. companies to comply with the laws and official practices of foreign countries in which they do business, while at the same time resisting involvement in secondary boycotts to which the United States is not a party. Such an exemption makes equally good sense with respect to payments to Government officials. In regulating U.S. firms, we simply must recognize that standards of business propriety vary widely throughout the world. To ignore this reality simply turns valuable export business over to our competitors without in any way upgrading foreign business practices.

The new restrictions I am proposing also clarify the current prohibitions against directing or authorizing third parties to make certain payments to foreign officials. Directions or authorizations by a U.S. person which are made "expressly or by a course of conduct" would constitute violations of the law.

One benefit of establishing these restrictions within a statute administered by the Department of Commerce would be to end the split in enforcement that exists under current law, and that has sometimes resulted in enforcement inconsistencies. Because the SEC has regulatory powers only over publicly held companies, enforcement of existing restrictions with respect to the activities of privately held companies has fallen to the Department of Justice. Under my proposal, enforcement of the restrictions applicable to all U.S. entities—both publicly and privately held—would be carried out by the Department of Commerce through its enforcement divisions, with the Justice Department having responsibility to prosecute any cases uncovered by Commerce involving criminal violations. This arrangement should result in more consistent and uniform interpretations of the prohibitions, and therefore greater equity and certainty for the businesses which must comply with them.

The Secretary of Commerce already has, under the Export Administration Act, most of the necessary enforcement tools, including powers to investigate, require reports and recordkeeping, issue subpoenas, and take sworn testimony. One enforcement authority not already provided by the act, the authority to seek injunctions, is specifically provided in my bill. My bill contains certain bookkeeping standards, and would limit liability for failure

simply to comply with bookkeeping requirements.

My bill, Mr. Speaker, would double the existing fines for prohibited payments. Having clarified the kinds of payments and other actions that are unacceptable for American businesses, I think it is appropriate and necessary to strengthen the deterrent against illicit practices in international business.

The Subcommittee on International Economic Policy and Trade of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, on which I have the honor to serve, needs to take a careful look at the effect on U.S. exports of prohibitions on payments to foreign government officials. Such a review would be pursuant to the committee's jurisdiction over export controls and export promotion, which is exercised at the subcommittee level by the International Economic Policy and Trade Subcommittee. The bill I am proposing today should provide a vehicle for such a review, and for possible revision of current prohibitions along the lines I am proposing, taking into account what appear to be costly negative effects on the U.S. balance of trade as a result of the current law. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to taking an active part in the subcommittee's review, and I commend this legislative proposal to all of my colleagues who share my feeling that we can no longer afford to sacrifice exports and the jobs that exports generate by unduly restricting our exporters. I believe this proposal will strongly discourage illicit payments to foreign officials without such costly disruptions of trade as have resulted from the ambiguities of the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act.

Mr. Speaker, I submit a copy of my proposal to be printed at this point in the RECORD.

H.R. ——. A BILL to amend the Export Administration Act of 1979 to prohibit certain actions to be taken by United States persons with respect to foreign officials

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Foreign Trade Practices Act of 1983".

SEC. 2. The Export Administration Act of 1979 is amended by inserting after section 8 the following new section:

"PROHIBITED ACTS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN OFFICIALS

"SEC. 8A. (a) PROHIBITION.—(1) It shall be unlawful for any United States person or any officer, director, employee, or any stockholder thereof acting on behalf of such United States person, acting in the interest or foreign commerce of the United States, corruptly to offer, pay, promise to pay, or authorize the payment of any money, or to offer, give, promise to give, or authorize the giving of anything of value to—

"(A) any foreign official for purposes of—
 "(i) influencing any act or decision of such foreign official in his official capacity, or inducing such foreign official to do or omit

any act in violation of his legal duty as a foreign official; or

"(ii) inducing such foreign official to use his influence with a foreign government or instrumentality thereof to affect or influence any act or decision of such government or instrumentality,

in order to assist such United States person in obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person; or

"(B) any foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office for purposes of—

"(i) influencing any act or decision of such party, official, or candidate in its or his official capacity, or inducing such party, official, or candidate to do or omit any act in violation of its or his legal duty as such a political party, official, or candidate; or

"(ii) inducing such party, official, or candidate to use its or his influence with a foreign government or instrumentality thereof to affect or influence any act or decision of such government or instrumentality,

in order to assist such United States person in obtaining or retaining business for or with, or directing business to, any person.

"(2) It shall be unlawful for any United States person, or any officer, director, employee, or stockholder thereof acting on behalf of such United States person, acting in the interstate or foreign commerce of the United States, corruptly to direct or authorize, expressly or by a course of conduct, a third party to offer, pay, promise, or give anything of value—

"(A) to any foreign official for any purpose set forth in paragraph (1)(A); or

"(B) to any foreign political party or official thereof or any candidate for foreign political office for any purpose set forth in paragraph (1)(B).

"(b) PERMISSIBLE ACTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to—

"(1) any payment the purpose of which is to expedite or to secure the performance of a routine governmental action;

"(2) any payment, gift, offer, or promise of anything of value which is permitted under any law, regulation, or policy of the government of the country involved;

"(3) any payment, gift, offer, or promise of anything of value which constitutes a courtesy, a token of regard or esteem, or in return for hospitality;

"(4) any expenditures, including travel and lodging expenses, associated with the selling or purchasing of goods or services or with the demonstration or explanation of products; or

"(5) any ordinary expenditures, including travel and lodging expenses, associated with the performance of a contract with a foreign government or agency thereof.

"(c) GUIDELINES FOR COMPLIANCE.—Not later than six months after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary, after consultation with the Attorney General, the United States Trade Representative, the Secretary of State, and the Secretary of the Treasury, and after obtaining the view of representatives of the business community and other interested persons through public notice and comment and in public hearings, shall determine to what extent the business community would be assisted by further clarification of the preceding provisions of this section and may, based on such determination and to the extent necessary and appropriate, issue—

"(1) guidelines describing specific types of conduct, associated with common types of export sales arrangements and business contracts, which the Secretary determines con-

stitute compliance with the preceding provisions of this section; and

"(2) general precautionary procedures which United States persons may use on a voluntary basis to ensure compliance with the preceding provisions of this section, and to create a rebuttable presumption of compliance with such provisions.

The Secretary shall issue the guidelines and procedures referred to in the preceding sentence in accordance with the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and those guidelines and procedures shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 7 of that title.

"(d) OPINIONS OF THE SECRETARY.—(1) The Secretary, after consultation with other Federal agencies and representatives from the business community, shall establish a procedure to provide responses to specific inquiries by United States persons concerning compliance with the preceding provisions of this section. The Secretary shall, within 30 days after receiving a request made in accordance with that procedure, regarding compliance with the preceding provisions this section, issue an opinion in response to that request. An opinion of the Secretary that certain prospective conduct does not violate the preceding provisions of this section shall be final and binding on all parties, subject to the discovery of new evidence with respect to the conduct. The Secretary shall establish the procedure pursuant to this paragraph in accordance with the provisions of subchapter II of chapter 5 of title 5, United States Code, and that procedure shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 7 of that title.

"(2) Any document or other material provided to, received by, or prepared in the Department of Commerce, or any other department or agency of the United States Government, in connection with a request by a United States person under the procedure established pursuant to paragraph (1) of this subsection concerning compliance with the preceding provisions of this section, or in connection with any investigations conducted with respect to violations of such provisions, shall be exempt from disclosure under section 552 of title 5, United States Code, regardless of whether the Department responds to such a request or the United States person withdraws such request before receiving a response. The Secretary shall protect the privacy of each such United States person, and shall adopt rules assuring that materials, documents, and information submitted in connection with such a request will be kept confidential and will not be used for any purpose that would unnecessarily discourage use of the procedure established pursuant to paragraph (1).

"(3) The Secretary shall, to the maximum extent practicable, provide timely guidance concerning compliance with the preceding provisions of this section to potential exporters and small businesses which are unable to obtain specialized counsel on issues pertaining to such subsections. Such guidance shall be limited to responses to requests under paragraph (1) concerning compliance and general explanations of compliance responsibilities and of potential liabilities under the preceding provisions of this section.

"(e) ACCOUNTING STANDARDS.—(1) For purposes of demonstrating compliance with the provisions of this section, each United States person described in subsection (f)(2)(A) of this section shall devise and maintain a system of internal accounting

controls sufficient to provide reasonable assurances that—

"(A) transactions are executed in accordance with management's general or specific authorization;

"(B) transactions are recorded as necessary (i) to permit preparation of financial statements in conformity with generally accepted accounting principles or any other criteria applicable to such statements, and (ii) to maintain accountability for assets;

"(C) access to assets is permitted only in accordance with management's general or specific authorization;

"(D) the recorded accountability for assets is compared with the existing assets at reasonable intervals and appropriate action is taken with respect to any differences; and

"(E) for the purposes of subparagraphs (A) through (D) of this paragraph, the United States person makes and keeps books, accounting records, and accounts which, in reasonable detail, accurately and fairly reflect the transactions and dispositions of the assets of the United States person.

"(2) No criminal liability shall be imposed for failing to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection.

"(3) No civil injunctive relief shall be imposed with respect to—

"(A) any United States person for failing to comply with the requirements of paragraph (1) of this subsection if such United States person shows that it acted in good faith in attempting to comply with such requirements; or

"(B) any person other than a United States person, in connection with a United States person's failure to comply with paragraph (1), unless such person knowingly caused the United States person to fail to devise or maintain a system of internal accounting controls that complies with paragraph (1).

"(4) No person shall knowingly circumvent a system of internal accounting controls established pursuant to paragraph (1) for a purpose inconsistent with paragraph (1).

"(5) Where a United States person holds 50 percent or less of the voting power with respect to a domestic or foreign concern, the provisions of paragraph (1) require only that the United States person proceed in good faith to use its influence, to the extent reasonable under that person's circumstances, including the relative degree of its ownership over the domestic or foreign concern and under the laws and practices governing the business operations of the country in which such concern is located, to cause such domestic or foreign concern to devise and maintain a system of internal accounting controls consistent with paragraph (1). Such a United States person shall be conclusively presumed to have complied with the provisions of paragraph (1) by demonstrating good faith efforts to use such influence.

"(6) For purposes of paragraph (1), the terms 'reasonable assurances' and 'reasonable detail' mean such degree of assurance and level of detail which a prudent individual would provide in the conduct of his own affairs, having in mind a comparison between benefits to be obtained from the system of internal accounting controls maintained and costs to be incurred in obtaining such benefits.

"(f) DEFINITIONS.—As used in this section—

"(1) the term 'foreign official' means any officer or employee of a foreign government

or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, or any person acting in an official capacity for or on behalf of any such government or department, agency, or instrumentality; and

"(2) the term 'United States person' means (A) any issuer which has a class of securities registered pursuant to section 12 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and any issuer which is required to file reports pursuant to section 15(d) of that Act; (B) any individual who is a citizen, national, or resident of the United States; of (C) any corporation, partnership, association, joint-stock company, business trust, unincorporated organization, or sole proprietorship which has its principal place of business in the United States, or which is organized under the laws of a State of the United States or a territory, possession, or commonwealth of the United States."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 11 of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2410) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b) by inserting in the section caption "and Other" after "Willful"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(3)(A)(i) Except as provided in clause (ii), any United States person which violates section 8A of this Act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$2,000,000.

"(ii) Any individual who is a United States person and who willfully violates section 8A of this Act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$20,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(B) Any officer or director of a United States person, or stockholder acting on behalf of such United States person, who willfully violates section 8A of this Act shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$20,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(C) Whenever a United States person is found to have violated section 8A of this Act, any employee of such United States person who is a United States citizen, national, or resident or is otherwise subject to the jurisdiction of the United States (other than an officer, director, or stockholder acting on behalf of such United States person), and who willfully carried out the act or practice constituting the violation shall, upon conviction, be fined not more than \$20,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

"(D) Whenever a fine is imposed under subparagraph (B) or (C) of this paragraph upon any officer, director, employee, or stockholder of a United States person, such fine shall not be paid, directly or indirectly, by such United States person."

SEC. 4. Section 12(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2411(a)) is amended—

(1) by inserting "(1)" immediately before "To the extent necessary"; and

(2) by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(2) Whenever it appears to the Secretary that any United States person or officer, director, employee, or stockholder thereof, is engaged, or is about to engage, in any act or practice constituting a violation of section 8A of this Act, the Secretary may bring a civil action in an appropriate district court of the United States to enjoin such act or practice, and upon a proper showing a permanent or temporary injunction or a temporary restraining order shall be granted without bond."

SEC. 5. Section 13(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App.

2412(a)) is amended by striking out "section 11(c)(2)" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 8A(c), 8A(d)(2) and 11(c)(2)".

SEC. 6. Section 16(2) of the Export Administration Act of 1979 (50 U.S.C. App. 2415(2)) is amended by inserting "(except as provided in section 8A(f)(2) of this Act)" after "means".

SEC. 7. (a) It is the sense of the Congress that the President should pursue the negotiation of an international agreement, among the largest possible number of countries, to govern persons from those countries concerning acts prohibited with respect to United States persons by section 8A(a) of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as added by section 2 of this Act. Such international agreement should include a process by which problems and conflicts associated with such acts could be resolved.

(b)(1) Within one year after the date of enactment of this Act, the President shall submit to the Congress a report on—

(A) the progress of the negotiations referred to in subsection (a);

(B) those steps which the executive branch and the Congress should consider taking in the event that these negotiations do not successfully eliminate the competitive disadvantage of United States businesses that results when persons from other countries commit the acts described in subsection (a); and

(C) possible actions that could be taken to promote cooperation by other countries in international efforts to prevent bribery of foreign officials, candidates, or parties in third countries.

(2) The President shall include in the report submitted pursuant to paragraph (1)—

(A) any legislative recommendations necessary to give the President the authority to take appropriate action to carry out subparagraphs (B) and (C) of paragraph (1);

(B) an analysis of the potential effect on the interests of the United States, including United States national security, when persons from other countries commit the acts described in subsection (a) of this section; and

(C) an assessment of the current and future role of private initiatives in curtailing such acts.●

ARIZONA VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP WINNER, JOSEPH A. BECK

HON. BOB STUMP

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. STUMP. Mr. Speaker, for the past 35 years, the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary have conducted the Voice of Democracy scholarship contest. This year, more than one-quarter of a million secondary school students participated. The contest theme was "Youth—America's Strength."

Mr. Joseph A. Beck is the Arizona winner of the 1982-83 program. He is a student at Kingman High School and a member of Who's Who Among American High School Students and the Society of American Distinguished High School Students. I would like to

submit the text of his winning speech for the record and highly recommend it to my colleagues.

YOUTH—AMERICA'S STRENGTH

What is really meant by the word strength? Webster defines it as the state or quality of being strong, vigorous, powerful, and morally or intellectually effective. I think all of us will agree that each of these fine qualities represents what America really is and stands for.

Over two-hundred years ago America started out as nothing more than a colony, and now it has become a durable and thriving nation. Throughout time, however, it has had to withstand many hardships, including wars, both foreign and domestic, and natural disasters. America's struggle to survive has been a long and difficult one, but, in spite of all this, America has remained as strong and spirited as it was in the beginning years.

What is the reason for America's success as a nation? I believe that the true strength lies in America's youth. Youth simply refers to an early period of existence or growth. When I think of the youth of America, two aspects come to mind. First, I think of our country's youth itself.

America is still a relatively young nation. Two-hundred years seems like a long time, but really isn't. America as a nation resembles the little children that are continually maturing and growing through each experience they encounter. America continues to learn from its challenging ordeals, and I feel that this is a key factor in America's strength. America has grown a great deal since its beginning; however, there will always be room for further improvement and development.

The other and perhaps most important factor in America's strength is its young people. The younger generation has many contributions that they can and will make in the years ahead. For example in the event of a war, America's youth will be out there fighting to preserve the ideals and accomplishments of this nation just as our forefathers were. Our youth will also be the ones who make our lives more enjoyable by designing and building the new technologically advanced products and services such as automobiles, new surgical procedures, and maybe even alternate fuel supplies. The applications for their abilities are many.

Youth are quite successful because they aren't quitters; they are go-getters, a philosophy that our forefathers thoroughly believed in. Today's youth, for the most part, are continually striving for the acme of success. We can see it in their writing, sporting activities and their overall actions.

America's youth is full of ambition. This gives them the motivation to try new things and seek solutions for old as well as new problems. Without motivation we won't try, and if we don't try, we will never know just how much we could have achieved.

It is the courage to be willing to take that first giant step that enabled America to send astronauts to the moon. I'm sure that the idea of man in space most likely sounded preposterous to the American people when they first heard of the idea; even the engineers were probably terrified, but they went ahead and tried. Now look how far we have progressed, both scientifically and technologically.

In the past, when our forefathers were in school, many of the every-increasing educational opportunities open to today's youth were not offered. The quality and depth of

education has played a tremendous role in strengthening America's youth. We are now learning more things than our predecessors ever could have. With this knowledge there is really no limit on how great we can make America.

Many solutions to problems, including overcrowding, medical disorders, and transportation problems, are now being worked out with impressive results. This is just some of the valuable progress America's younger generation has begun to make.

God has continually blessed our nation and its people. He has given our nation beautiful pastures, lakes, and streams. He has definitely made America beautiful from ocean to ocean and sea to shining sea.

I am very thankful that I am able to live in a country where we are free to express our thoughts and ideas freely, believe as we choose and live the way we please. This wonderful nation, where all these things are possible, is America. It is great to be an American youth.●

DIESEL FUEL EXCISE TAX

HON. BILL FRENZEL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. FRENZEL. Mr. Speaker, today, my colleagues Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. JENKINS, and I introduced legislation to repeal the burdensome user fee placed on truckers in the Surface Transportation Act of 1982, and replace it with a more equitable tax based on diesel fuel used by the trucking industry.

In the 1982 act, the highway user fees imposed on truckers increased on the average 800 percent, regardless of the varying distances which the different operators actually used the highways. Although I was a firm supporter of the Surface Transportation Act, I have been working with my colleagues in drafting legislation which would tax the users of our Nation's highway system in a more equitable manner.

In my judgment, our bill achieves this purpose. The bill proposes to replace the entire user fee with an increase in the diesel fuel tax of 3 cents in 1983, and 2 cents more in 1984. I believe that this is a more fair system of taxing truckers for the proportionately larger share of damage which their use of the highways is alleged to cause. It can also be more easily assimilated by the trucking industry because it is a pay-as-you-go system.

The American Trucking Association has examined our proposal, and has given it its full, unqualified, support as an equitable replacement for the user fees imposed by last year's act.

Our proposal is a good, fair means of dealing with a very difficult problem. I urge all of my colleagues to join us in supporting this effort.●

RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to commend the Southern California Edison Co. for the effective implementation of a residential utility conservation advisory committee (RUCAC).

RUCAC was established to bring together community input in an effort to properly address the needs of customers regarding conservation and consumer-related issues.

After almost 2 years in operation, RUCAC has enjoyed the benefits of addressing and balancing the needs of various constituencies into effective residential conservation programs, as well as other Edison consumer-related programs.

RUCAC has served as an effective sounding board for innovative energy conservation approaches, providing advice on the effects on small businesses, ethnic, and cultural barriers. RUCAC is also considered to be an integral element in the planning and development of the residential conservation services program. I highly commend this approach to other utilities as a way of easing the burden of high energy prices—not only on the consumer, but as a way of easing pressure on the utilities themselves.

I applaud this corporate effort to be responsive to the energy needs of the consumer, and in so doing bring about effective and efficient conserving of energy.

I include the announcement by Edison which outlines the specifics of this program:

RESIDENTIAL UTILITY CONSERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE (RUCAC) FACT SHEET

Edison established the 15-member Residential Utility Conservation Advisory Committee (RUCAC) in 1980, in response to the state's plan for Residential Conservation Services (RCS).

In addition to RCS, RUCAC was charged with other areas of responsibility including involvement in consumer related issues, conservative and load management programs and in general, learning more about how Edison conducts business.

RUCAC members are representatives from local government, energy-related organizations, local unions, small energy-related business, Hispanic, Black, Asian, American Indian communities and represent various climatic/regional areas throughout Edison's service territory. Because of this diverse representation, RUCAC has provided a balanced understanding of consumer view points.

As per the RUCAC plan, each member serves an 18-month term with five new members appointed every six months to replace those members who have completed

their term. In total 36 members have been appointed to RUCAC since its inception.

Throughout 1981/82, RUCAC assisted and was instrumental in identifying special needs of customers by developing the RCS program announcement, marketing and geographic strategy; reviewed and commented on Edison's RCS auditor and inspector training programs; and critiqued supplemental RCS brochures. RUCAC also reviewed, discussed and/or provided input on other Edison issues including 1981 conservation and load management programs, lifeline allocations, rate case procedures, nuclear energy licensing procedure, Edison's financial structure, PURPA rate information to customers, and Edison's 1982 advertising campaign.●

ECONOMIC EQUITY ACT OF 1983

HON. JAMES L. OBERSTAR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, the Economic Equity Act of 1983 was introduced Monday in both the House of Representatives and the Senate. I am very pleased to be one of the original cosponsors of this omnibus legislation which is designed to address inequities in a variety of existing laws as they pertain to women.

The Economic Equity Act (EEA) was first introduced in 1981 and had broad bipartisan support in the Congress. The revised legislation reflects the passage of some sections in the 97th Congress and has been expanded to deal more effectively with the economic necessities of women who work both in and outside the home.

In my State of Minnesota, women accounted for 43 percent of the labor force in 1980. More than three-fifths of employed women in the State work full time. Nearly half of the Nation's work force are women and two-thirds of these women are single, widowed, divorced, or working to keep their families out of poverty. Good quality child-care facilities are extremely important to working women.

The EEA would expand the sliding scale for tax credits for child care, allow nonprofit organizations providing work-related child care to be eligible for tax-exempt status, provide for the refundability of the child-care tax credit, and establish a grant program to provide seed money to community-based clearinghouses for child-care information and referral.

Although female-headed families represent only 10 percent of all families in Minnesota, they account for one-third of the State's families living in poverty. Half of all children in poverty in our country live in female-headed households, and two-thirds of these children depend on the AFDC program for their survival. Child support payments are critical to these families.

Studies show that 59 percent of divorced mothers have been granted child support awards, but almost half do not receive payments. The EEA would amend the child support program under title IV-D, Social Security Act, to clearly state that the purpose of the program is to secure child support for the non-AFDC cases as well as for AFDC cases. It would also allow States to withhold Federal income tax refunds from absent parents who owe past due child support for non-AFDC children, as well as AFDC children. It would also create an automatic assignment of Federal civilian employees' wages when child support is ordered, modified, or enforced by States.

The Economic Equity Act also calls for private and public pension reform. The private pension system, as regulated by ERISA, often fails to recognize that both spouses make significant contributions toward an employee's ability to earn wages and tends to disregard the economic value of women in their roles as wives, widows, mothers, and workers. The civil service retirement program fails to provide pension or retirement benefits to the divorced and widowed wives of civil service employees, even though they have devoted many years to maintaining the home and family. Inequities in both the private and civil service pension systems are addressed by the EEA.

Discrimination against women in insurance, tax policy, and regulations are also targeted by the EEA, as well as other inequities that affect their economic well-being.

Enactment of the Economic Equity Act should be a major goal of the 98th Congress. I urge my colleagues to join with me and the over 100 other cosponsors of the act in working to insure its enactment in this Congress.●

STATEMENT SUPPORTING THE CONTINUED PRESENCE OF ISRAELI TROOPS IN LEBANON UNTIL A SIMULTANEOUS, GRADUAL WITHDRAWAL CAN BE NEGOTIATED

HON. KENT HANCE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. HANCE. Mr. Speaker, Secretary of State George P. Shultz recently said the United States may be willing to expand our military presence in Lebanon as one means of helping Israel protect its northern border. I wholeheartedly oppose such an increase in the U.S. military presence because it leaves our troops in a vulnerable position. The March 16 grenade attack on five U.S. marines highlights the need to remove all foreign forces

from Lebanon. Instead of increasing participation by any foreign force in Lebanon, I urge consideration for a simultaneous, gradual withdrawal by all such forces. I believe that a simultaneous withdrawal of all foreign forces is a better alternative to increased U.S. military participation because such a gradual withdrawal will foster security and stability. Forcing only Israel to withdraw is not the solution. If Israel alone pulls its troops out immediately, chaos will almost surely occur. But, simultaneous withdrawal would encourage the reemergence of a stable and independent Lebanon.

A simultaneous, gradual withdrawal makes sense because of the current disunity among the various Lebanese factions. It provides the Lebanese Government with the necessary time to unify and stabilize into a strong central and democratic government, a necessity if Lebanon is to return to its previous position as an oasis of stable moderation in the Middle East. If the Israelis alone are forced to withdraw from Lebanon in the immediate future, the vacuum left by their departure would quickly be filled by radical elements bent on preventing the formation of a unified democratic Lebanon. At this time, the Lebanese army appears unable to provide the necessary support to the Government to prevent this very real possibility from occurring.

Now, Israel is being forced to accept indirect responsibility for the recent refugee massacre because Israeli troops failed to prevent one Lebanese group from killing another Lebanese group inside Lebanon. Israeli withdrawal at this time, without a simultaneous withdrawal by Syrian forces and the PLO, would only remove a strong deterrent to such infighting and would continue the bloodshed and destruction of the last 10 years. If Israel pulls out immediately, Lebanon will have no one to help keep the warring Lebanese factions apart.

Most importantly, Israel has received no confirmed assurances that Syria and the PLO will withdraw at the same time with Israel. Israel cannot be expected to withdraw unless and until these confirmed assurances have been given. To force Israel to do otherwise would negate the reason for their original entry into Lebanon. Furthermore, it would encourage the possibility of a PLO reentry into Lebanon backed by the Soviet-supported Syrian military. This must not be allowed to happen, and the only way to insure its prevention is to support a simultaneous, gradual withdrawal by all foreign forces, including Israel, Syria, and the PLO.

A free Lebanon and peace in the Middle East are the ultimate goals we all seek. Israel recognizes, as we do, that it must withdraw; but to withdraw overnight, without confirmed as-

surances of a simultaneous withdrawal by Syria and the PLO would only undermine the existing fragile peace in the area and could seriously jeopardize any hopes for a lasting future peace. Increased U.S. military participation would not accomplish this goal; a gradual withdrawal will. We must not forget that Israel is our friend and ally. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, that we must stand behind them and support their desire for a simultaneous, gradual withdrawal. I urge this august body to pledge itself toward that end.

Thank you.●

AMERICAN GI FORUM HONORS DR. HECTOR GARCIA

HON. SOLOMON P. ORTIZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. ORTIZ. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to your attention the achievements of an outstanding Mexican American, Dr. Hector P. Garcia. Dr. Garcia is the founder of the American GI Forum.

Dr. Garcia has a long history of service to his country and to Hispanics. During World War II, he served in the infantry and was awarded the Bronze Star. He has represented Presidents Kennedy, Johnson, and Carter, first in 1961 as a member of the American delegation at the signing of the Mutual Defense Area Agreement between the United States and the Federation of West Indies. In 1967, Dr. Garcia was appointed by President Johnson as a delegate to the United Nations, serving with the rank of Ambassador. Dr. Garcia was later named a Commissioner of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights. He remains a member of the Texas State Advisory Committee to the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights.

It was his concern for human rights that led Dr. Garcia, in 1948, to found the American GI Forum. The need for the forum became apparent as Mexican Americans returning from World War II were having trouble securing VA benefits. The movement for Hispanic rights was further spurred a year later, when a Mexican-American war casualty was denied burial in a cemetery that had, up to that time, excluded minorities.

The American GI Forum, in its 35 years, has become one of the largest Hispanic organizations in the country, with over 20,000 members in 30 States. The scope of the forum has broadened from the protection of veteran and veteran family rights to the protection of human rights for all Hispanics and minorities. The forum places special emphasis on education to improve the quality of life for Hispanics and minority groups. The forum has estab-

lished several programs to carry out its goals.

The Hispanic Education Fund of the United States solicits money from private sources for college scholarships awarded through American GI Forum local chapters. The veterans outreach program of the American GI Forum offers on-the-job training and veteran job placement. SER, short for service education redevelopment, also provides on-the-job and vocational training.

Dr. Garcia has continued his role in assisting Hispanics and minorities. Through the forum, he has worked to insure the rights of Hispanics to juries by their peers in civil and criminal cases. Dr. Garcia has been a leader in voter registration drives for Hispanics and in seeking the provision of bilingual services in schools and public and community services. He has also been an advocate for migrant farmworkers in their attempts to secure a minimum working wage.

In celebration of its 35th anniversary, the American GI Forum will be honoring Dr. Garcia and another most important Mexican American, Domingo Pena. Mr. Pena, who died this past January, was a Corpus Christi radio and television personality who on his own, and in conjunction with the forum, devoted efforts to further the advancement of Hispanics. He raised funds for Hispanics left homeless by fire and other circumstances. Mr. Pena was also instrumental in sending many Hispanic youth to college; in 1966, Mr. Pena traveled to Vietnam to entertain American troops.

Mr. Speaker, as Hispanics become America's largest minority, it is important that the contributions of Mexican Americans be increasingly recognized. It is a pleasure for me to join with the members of my community in honoring the achievements of Dr. Hector P. Garcia and Mr. Domingo Pena.●

DECONTROL

HON. BRIAN J. DONNELLY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DONNELLY. Mr. Speaker, as we are all aware, the President has announced his intentions to seek legislation which would decontrol domestic natural gas prices. This proposal which would decontrol all forms of natural gas on January 1, 1986, would place additional financial burdens on those who can least afford them.

With the present oil glut and declining worldwide prices, I believe that this is precisely the wrong action at the wrong time. With the gains made in reducing our dependency on imported oil, it would be disastrous for the Congress to pass legislation which

would substantially increase domestic energy prices. We would be in effect telling the American consumer and businessman that we should return to our old practice of depending upon cheaper oil from unstable nations for our energy needs.

This legislation also creates other problems which the Congress has seen in the past. If we plan to decontrol all forms of natural gas in 1986, we destroy any incentive to producers to market their old gas found before 1978. Actions by oil producers in the mid to late 1970's shows the problems created by future decontrol.

Today I have introduced a resolution stating that it is the sense of the Congress that the natural gas deregulation schedule should not be accelerated. Although, I believe that the Natural Gas Policy Act of 1978 needs to be reviewed. I also believe that total decontrol of all forms of natural gas would be disastrous. Hopefully, we can prevent the administration from pursuing this most unwise action.●

IN SUPPORT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

HON. BARBARA A. MIKULSKI

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to speak in support of our Federal employees throughout the country.

During the past 2 months, I traveled extensively through my district in Maryland, and listened as Federal employees told me about legitimate and well-founded concerns.

They are worried about having to pay a huge percentage of their paycheck to both their pension plan and to social security. With the new social security legislation that brings new Federal workers into the social security system, those new workers could pay up to 14 or 18 percent of their paycheck in order to meet contributions to both plans.

Second, both old and new Federal employees are concerned that even after years of faithful service and paying into their pension fund, that fund will then be so eroded that retirement money will not be there when they are ready to collect.

It is time that we took a long hard look at what this Congress is doing to our Federal employees. We need legislation that protects Federal employees.

I know how valuable Federal employees are, and I know first hand. In my home State of Maryland, Federal employees are critical to the operation of the port. They work in the Coast Guard, in the Customs House, and in the Federal Maritime Administration.

And I have Federal workers in the Health Care Finance Administration, and in our Social Security offices.

We ask our good people at the port to help the private sector move goods, safely and quickly, and in return we tell them that they may not be able to depend on us in their old age.

We ask our people at the Health Care Financing Administration to keep health costs down, and then we tell those same Federal employees that they are going to have their health benefits reduced. We ask our Federal employees at Social Security to implement enormous changes to protect our elderly, and then we tell them that their own retirement system is in jeopardy.

Federal employees need to have those inequities remedied, and they deserve to have their concerns addressed through strong legislation.

That is why I am giving my wholehearted support to the resolution introduced by Congresswoman BARBARA BOXER of California. This resolution calls upon the Congress to make sure that the obligations of the existing civil service retirement system are met.

Simply put, this resolution is a message from the House of Representatives to the committees instructing them to take the concerns of Federal workers seriously.

I believe the Boxer resolution is an important statement, and a strong beginning. Coupled with the proposed repeal of the medicare tax, which I have cosponsored, I believe we will move forward, one swift step at a time, to take care of our Federal employees with the same quality and devotion that they have given to this country.●

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED TO PREVENT OFFSHORE LEASING OF ENVIRONMENTALLY SENSITIVE AREAS

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, Representative LEON PANETTA and I last week introduced legislation to remove certain carefully selected areas of the Atlantic and Pacific Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) from oil leasing consideration until the end of this century. An identical bill is being introduced by Senators KENNEDY, TSONGAS, and CRANSTON.

We are taking this step because we believe it is the only method by which a genuine balance between the need for oil and gas development and environmental protection can be achieved. Secretary of the Interior James Watt has consistently failed to live up to his responsibility to administer the off-

shore oil leasing program in a manner which respects the needs of competing users of the sea, including the fishing industry, and those dependent on tourism for a livelihood. Given the amount of OCS available, the United States does not, at the moment, have a critical need to exploit those areas of the Outer Continental Shelf affected by our legislation. Nor does the oil industry have the ability at present to expand its exploration and production activities into these areas to expand its exploration and production activities into these areas in an efficient or economic way.

The United States does, however, and will always have the need for a prosperous fishing and shellfishing industry in the northwest Atlantic, a healthy and productive ecosystem on Georges Bank, and a healthy tourist industry on our Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Our legislation will not forever preclude oil and gas development in the areas affected by the bill, but will instead leave the leasing decision more perceptive, we hope, than that presently represented by Mr. Watt.

The areas in the North Atlantic which would be temporarily removed from leasing consideration by our legislation are all of particular economic or ecological importance. Together, they constitute less than 30 percent of the total North Atlantic planning area which will be available for leasing when the third OCS lease sale in the region is conducted in March of 1984.

Under our legislation, the following four areas will be protected from oil and gas leasing until at least the year 2000:

First, a 50-mile buffer zone around the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This deletion is necessary to protect the Massachusetts coast—which supports a vital tourist industry—against the threat of an oil spill reaching shore. The buffer zone has been respected both in the November 1979 lease sale (No. 42) and in the sale slated for later this month (No. 52);

Second, tracts in and at the head of submarine canyons: These areas provide important habitats for lobsters whose populations could be adversely affected by exposure to oil spills, drill muds, or the siltation that would arise from drilling activity;

Third, tracts within the 60-meter isobath on Georges Bank: This area serves as an important spawning for haddock, grey sole, flounder, cod, and sea herring. Also, the water circulation pattern in these shallow waters is such that an oil spill could be retained in the area for a long period of time, thereby causing serious population declines in one or more species;

Fourth, the Great South Channel: This area is one of the prime fishing grounds in the North Atlantic, with yields among the highest—in terms of tonnage per year—in the region. Fur-

ther, the Boston Harbor shipping traffic lane and the Ambrose-Nantucket shipping traffic lane merge in this channel, and the channel appears to be the passageway of the Northern Right Whale into the Gulf of Maine.

In addition, a number of tracts on Georges Bank would be removed from the program until 1990 for further study on the feasibility of allowing oil and gas activity in this area.

Our legislation will not, if enacted, hinder in any significant way the continuation of an orderly, and balanced program of offshore oil and gas leasing and development. The legislation does reflect, however, a feeling on our part that Congress must play a more direct role in determining which areas of the Outer Continental Shelf should be leased now, and which should be held back for possible exploitation by future generations of Americans. James Watt would like to offer for lease the entire Outer Continental Shelf in 5 years. That strategy makes neither economic nor environmental sense, and Congress ought not to sit quietly on the sidelines while it is put into effect.●

THE NEW DELHI SUMMIT'S ALTERNATIVES TO WAR

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, as this House considers the merits of approving a mutual and verifiable nuclear freeze, I think it may be of value to consider what the nonaligned countries have proposed.

At the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament, Prime Minister of India, Indira Gandhi presented a detailed proposal calling for a freeze on existing stockpiles, a freeze on the production and testing of all nuclear weapons, negotiations to achieve a treaty on general and complete disarmament between the United States and the Soviet Union among other things. The Summit of nonaligned countries in New Delhi should provide us with an interesting and valuable perspective on what our Third World and nonaligned neighbors perceive to be solutions to the world problem of nuclear arms proliferation.

Mr. Yeshwantrao Chavan, a member of the Indian Parliament has summarized some of those proposals in an article which appears in the Christian Science Monitor. I submit the text of the article to you for insertion into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

THE NEW DELHI SUMMIT'S ALTERNATIVES TO WAR

(By Yeshwantrao B. Chavan)

At the New Delhi summit meeting of non-aligned countries beginning today India will

press for detailed consideration of the proposals presented by Prime Minister Indira Gandhi to the Second United Nations Special Session on Disarmament:

To negotiate a binding convention on the non-use of nuclear weapons.

As a first step toward the eventual cutting of existing stockpiles, there must be a freeze on nuclear weapons, providing for the total stoppage of any further production of nuclear weapons, combined with a cut-off in the production of fissionable material for weapons purposes.

Immediate suspension of all nuclear weapons tests.

Disarmament negotiations must once again revert to the task of achieving a Treaty on General and Complete Disarmament, within an agreed time frame as was discussed between the US and USSR in the agreed principles and draft treaties of the early '60s. Although the problems involved have become far more complex, the basic approach and the principles then formulated could still provide a basis for meaningful negotiations.

The United Nations and its specialized agencies should take the lead in educating the public on the dangers of nuclear war, on the harmful effects of the arms race on the world economy, as well as the positive aspects of disarmament and its link with development.

Between the principles of the UN Charter and the principles of peaceful coexistence there is an immediate and obvious correspondence. If nevertheless there is a striking difference in the methods of conflict resolution adopted by the nonaligned movement, on the one hand, and the United Nations, on the other, it is because great power rivalry has imprinted its methodology of international relations management on the UN, rendering it impotent, if not irrelevant, in most international crises.

It is perhaps this that has evoked the cry of agony from the new Secretary General, Javier Perez de Cuellar, in his report to the last session of the General Assembly on the need for deep thought on the decision-making structures of the UN.

It is a cry that finds a ready echo in the nonaligned movement. It is, therefore, to be expected that the New Delhi summit will launch a fresh initiative in this direction.

When fainthearts and skeptics wonder how the weakest two-thirds of the nations of the world can pit an effective alternative to the management of world relations wrought by the great power blocs, and the practitioners of hard-nosed realities scoff at the sanctimonious sentimentality of the moral authority of nonalignment, the words of Jawaharlal Nehru echo over two decades of the nonaligned movement's pursuit of the alternative:

"Our capacity is limited, but we have a certain strength, call it what you like, moral strength, or other strength. Let us use it properly, rightly—without force but with courtesy and with a friendly approach so that we may influence those who have the power of war and peace in their hands and thus try, if not to prevent war for all time, at any rate, to push it away so that in the meantime the world may learn better the uses of cooperation. Then ultimately the world may put an end to war itself."

Therefore, until that distant day dawns when the great powers adopt the alternative vision of the management of international relations, which is at the genesis of both the nonaligned movement and the United Nations Charter, the prime concern and fore-

most duty of the movement rests in exploring and articulating, in specifics and in particulars, alternative methods of preserving world peace in the face of the destabilization inherent in the great power confrontation and rivalry.

(Yeshwantrao B. Chavan, formerly minister of external affairs for India and currently a member of Parliament, is attending the current nonaligned summit in New Delhi.)

RELIGIOUS LEADERS SPEAK OUT ON DEFENSE BUDGET

HON. BRUCE F. VENTO

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● **Mr. VENTO.** Mr. Speaker, today the House of Representatives will consider historic legislation, the nuclear freeze resolution. If enacted, this legislation will put the House on record as firmly opposing the Reagan administration nuclear weapons' policies. It will be a repudiation of the strategies that have fostered administration pronouncements on a "limited or winnable" nuclear war and an unprecedented nuclear weapons' buildup.

The nuclear freeze movement is truly a grassroots movement. Concerned by the administration's actions and statements, the American people have spoken out in opposition to the great risk that our nuclear policies present. We have all met with concerned citizens and civic and church leaders on this issue. Their concerns are the same. They believe it is time to call a halt to our progress down the paths of destruction.

We are all aware of the deliberations of the American Council of Catholic Bishops on the use of nuclear weapons. The council has properly rejected the heavy-handed intrusion by the administration into its deliberations. Their voice is an important call for a path of sanity.

Equally important is a statement by other religious leaders in opposition to Reagan's defense policies. These leaders represent over 50 million members.

This statement condemns the President's budget and states that the budget shows a nation "intent on a selfish and dangerous course of social stinginess and military overkill." It is ironic that as this statement was issued, the President was making his well-publicized pitch for his defense policies to another group of religious leaders.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge that our colleagues listen to the American people and support the nuclear freeze resolution. At this time I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention the Washington Post, March 9 article on the statement by U.S. religious leaders.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 9, 1983]

MINISTERS ISSUE STATEMENT CALLING REAGAN'S DEFENSE BUDGET "OVERKILL"

A group of religious leaders, using strong moral language, said yesterday that President Reagan's budget shows a nation "intent on a selfish and dangerous course of social stinginess and military overkill."

The leaders called on Congress to refuse any more cuts in survival programs for the poor, to pass the jobs and emergency relief legislation, to cancel the MX missile and B1 bomber and reduce military spending.

The leaders, representing religious bodies with more than 50 million members, issued what they termed "a call for a just federal budget." They said the federal budget is the most important moral statement the government will make this year.

"We are profoundly disturbed by the vision which emerges from this fiscal 1984 edition of our statement of moral purpose. It is a vision of a nation intent on a selfish and dangerous course of social stinginess and military overkill," the statement said.

The statement was signed by:

Bishop John Hurst Adams, African Methodist Episcopal Church; Robert Campbell, general secretary, American Baptist Churches; James Hornback, president, American Ethical Union; Henry Siegman, executive director, American Jewish Congress; Dr. Kenneth Teegarden, president, Christian Church (Disciples of Christ); Bishop Nathaniel Linsey, Christian Methodist Episcopal Church; Robert Neff, general secretary, Church of the Brethren General Board; Kara Cole, Friends United Meeting; Gordon Browne, Friends World Committee for Consultation, Section of Americas; Dr. C. J. Mallory, Jr., general secretary, Progressive National Baptist Convention; Rev. Arlie Brouwer, general secretary, Reformed Church in America; Rabbi Alexander Schindler, president, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Sandra Mitchell Caron, moderator, Unitarian Universalist Association; Dr. Eugene Pickett, president, Unitarian-Universalist Association of Congregations; Bishop Leroy Hodapp, president, United Methodist Board of Church and Society; Dr. William Thompson, stated clerk, United Presbyterian Church; Dr. James Andrews, stated clerk, Presbyterian Church, U.S.; and Avery Post, president, United Church of Christ.

BOUCHER BACKS ANTIDRUG LEGISLATION

HON. RICK BOUCHER

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● **Mr. BOUCHER.** Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, I met with Virginia Attorney General Gerald L. Baliles, State Senator James Jones of Abingdon, and State Delegate John G. Dicks of Chester. These gentlemen, representing Gov. Chuck Robb and the Virginia General Assembly, presented me with a resolution passed unanimously by the assembly calling for an end to the importation of illegal drugs from foreign countries into the United States.

I am proud to join Virginia's war on drug traffickers. In response to the

Virginia Assembly's resolution, I am cosponsoring H.R. 41 to require that a country receiving foreign aid cooperate with the United States in our efforts to stop the flow of illegal drugs into this country.

According to the Drug Enforcement Administration, over 90 percent of all illegal drugs in the United States come from foreign countries, including all heroin and cocaine, and 85 percent of all marijuana.

Drug trafficking is a major criminal enterprise, amassing millions of dollars in illegal profits. Combating drug traffickers consumes a large portion of local law enforcement budgets each year.

Children are experimenting with drugs at ever-younger ages. A 1982 study by the National Institute on Drug Abuse reports that 27.3 percent of 12- to 17-year-olds have used illegal drugs. I know this is a major concern among parents in the Ninth Congressional District of Virginia, which I represent.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 41 to help halt the flow of illegal drugs into the United States.

HOMESTEADING ACT OF 1983

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● **Ms. OAKAR.** Mr. Speaker, today Representative COYNE of Pennsylvania introduced legislation which will amend the Homesteading Act to expand the size and scope of the program. Specifically, it will target the program to low- and moderate-income households, provide rehabilitation assistance for low- and moderate-income homesteaders, allow cities to use program funds to acquire privately owned abandoned houses for homesteading purposes, and remove multifamily homesteading from "demonstration" status integrating the multifamily program into the single family program.

Homesteading has been a success, according to a broad spectrum of evaluators. In its final report, the President's Commission on Housing endorsed single-family and multi-family homesteading "as a means of providing homeownership opportunities to low- and moderate-income renters." A 1979 GAO report described section 810, the homesteading program as "a good program needing improvement."

Despite the evident effectiveness of homesteading, it has not come close to realizing its potential as a housing program for the Nation's low- and moderate-income families. In 8 years of operation, the section 810 program has turned over less than 10,000 houses. By contrast, the city of Philadelphia alone has more than 20,000 abandoned

units. A conservative estimate is that nationally there are more than 200,000 units suitable for homesteading. Hundreds of abandoned units are being added to that stock every week. At the same time there are at least 3 million low-income households living in physically inadequate rental housing and at least 6 million low-income households paying more than 30 percent of their income for rent. Many of these households possess the skills and motivation to be homesteaders. A 1982 HUD report states that—

The most serious negative entry in the homesteading ledger is the modest number of units which it has included . . . the potential for homesteading far exceeds the level of activity to date.

The costs of homestead rehabilitation are often lower than is generally believed. Highly motivated individuals and families, such as the ones that testified in hearings last June have demonstrated that they have the skills or have the capacity to organize assistance from families, friends, and neighborhood organization.

In 1980, we are no longer facing a housing quality crisis. Well below 10 percent of our housing is dilapidated or lacking basic plumbing facilities. However, we do face a shortage of available affordable housing. There are at least five times as many families eligible for subsidized housing as there are units available. More than one fifth of all households can not afford decent housing. More than 6 million households pay over half their income for shelter. Housing costs have skyrocketed in recent years. The median income for homeowners rose 104 percent while median value of homes tripled. Median renter income rose 66 percent while median rents increased by 123 percent. And the rapid rise in housing costs has risen higher for low-income people. There are twice as many renter households with incomes below \$3,000 as there are rental units available at 25 percent of their income.

The homesteading program has proven its worth, and should be expanded. We need these kinds of programs to revitalize our neighborhoods, and to provide an affordable means of acquiring housing for low- and moderate-income people. I invite you to join in cosponsorship of this legislation which will put our abandoned housing back into the housing stock by using the initiative and hard work of our citizens.●

OMB CIRCULAR A-122

HON. STEWART B. McKINNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. McKINNEY. Mr. Speaker and colleagues, we have all become too fa-

miliar with the recent OMB Circular A-122 proposing new regulations governing the cost principles for nonprofit organizations. This cryptic title conceals a serious assault on free speech that rightly has nonprofit institutions across the country up in arms. I believe that the administration's proposal contains a selective interpretation of the first amendment which endangers the foundation of representative government.

Section 501 of the Internal Revenue Code currently prohibits tax-exempt organizations from political activities. By altering the definition of political advocacy from influencing legislation to attempting to influence governmental decisions, OMB is creating a deliberately confusing definition that will certainly lead to litigation and possibly open the door to Government restrictions on the open dissemination of information. The statement included in the Federal Register that "this proposal will promote the first amendment value that a person can freely speak, or refrain from speaking, on public matters," seems to me a novel interpretation of the first amendment and one which invites curtailment of the freedom of speech.

OMB claims that it is not seeking to prevent tax-exempt organizations from publishing newsletters, talking to Congressmen, or testifying before committees, but rather to make the organizations pay for these activities at other-than-public expense. My colleagues are surely aware that, at this time of fiscal austerity, the result of this change, whatever its supposed purpose, would be liquidation of many tax-exempt organizations or complete cessation of these advocacy activities. I cannot help but reach the conclusion that the administration has promulgated these changes in an attempt to eliminate those organizations, such as the Legal Services Corporation, which it has failed to eliminate because of congressional opposition.

Out of a concern for honest, effective Government which I believe is shared by this administration, I have asked, as have many of my colleagues, that OMB retract this proposal before it does any further harm. If the agency cannot abide by the current language concerning tax-exempt organizations and political activity, then it should frame another proposal with greater respect for the principles of free thought and speech.●

IN MEMORIAM: WADE BARBER OF PITTSBORO, N.C. (APR. 20, 1893-SEPT. 2, 1982)

HON. IKE ANDREWS

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. ANDREWS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, Wade Barber of Pittsboro, Chatham County, N.C., was a public-spirited man who served the people of our State with great distinction and honor. When he died last September 2 at the age of 89, he left behind a legacy of outstanding public service. He was one of the most respected and astute attorneys our State has produced, and he put that knowledge of the law to work as town and county attorney, as county solicitor, and in general practice. He also represented the people of Chatham County in both houses of our State general assembly. One of his most enduring contributions is the role he played as State senator in upgrading the University of North Carolina School of Medicine, now recognized around the world as a center for excellence in medical education.

It was my privilege to call Wade Barber friend. As a young attorney fresh out of law school, I was fortunate to come under his tutelage, and I am grateful for that which he taught me. He was a warm, humorous, generous man who enriched the lives of all he touched. We shall miss him.

Recently, the North Carolina General Assembly paid fitting tribute to Wade Barber by passing the following resolution, which I am pleased to share with you today. The resolution reads:

RESOLUTION 3; HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 105

Whereas, Wade Barber was born in North Wilkesboro on April 20, 1893, and died a resident of Pittsboro, Chatham County, September 2, 1982; and

Whereas, Wade Barber was graduated from Pittsboro High School, Guilford College, and The University of North Carolina School of Law; and

Whereas, Wade Barber began his practice of law March 1916 in Pittsboro at the age of 23 and ultimately served as town attorney, Chatham County attorney, county solicitor, member of the State Bar Council and was esteemed as an outstanding advocate for all whom he represented in his general practice, and was senior partner in the firm of Barber, Holmes and McLaurin upon his death; and

Whereas, Wade Barber made numerous civic contributions to his community and his State including: service as a trustee of The University of North Carolina and for 15 years a member of its executive committee; Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Bank of Pittsboro, and as a Director of the Central Carolina Bank and Trust Company; and

Whereas, Wade Barber was active in his dedication and service to the Democratic party; including service as the Chairman of

the party in Chatham County during the years 1930-1938 and 1950-1968; and

Whereas, Wade Barber was a member of the North Carolina House of Representatives in 1925 and 1945 and the North Carolina Senate in 1939, 1943, and 1947 during which tenure he served as Chairman of the Senate Public Welfare and Appropriations Committees and as a member of the Advisory Budget Commission; and

Whereas, during the 1945 and 1947 Sessions of the General Assembly, Wade Barber was a major force in obtaining funds for The University of North Carolina Medical School and North Carolina Memorial Hospital; and

Whereas, after his service in the General Assembly, Wade Barber continued to work with the Legislature as a respected legislative lobbyist; and

Whereas, Wade Barber was dedicated in his service to the Presbyterian Church, including service as an elder, Sunday school teacher and trustee in the Pittsboro Presbyterian Church for 42 years; and

Whereas, whether as an attorney, civic leader, political leader, legislator, or church leader, the name of Wade Barber meant respect and integrity;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the House of Representatives, the Senate concurring:

SECTION 1. The General Assembly recognizes the achievements of Wade Barber and expresses its appreciation for his contributions to the State.

Sec. 2. The General Assembly extends its deepest sympathy to the family and friends of Wade Barber and mourns the loss of this able and devoted public servant.

Sec. 3. The Secretary of State shall send certified copies of this resolution to the children of Wade Barber—Wade Barber, Jr., Betty Scott Smith, and Mary Hayes Holmes.

Sec. 4. This resolution is effective upon ratification.●

SBA LOAN MONEY FOR VETERANS

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, last week the House of Representatives successfully overturned an attempt by the Office of Management and Budget to defer all direct loan money in the Small Business Administration. Included in this package was \$25 million for direct loans to Vietnam and disabled veterans. I applaud the House decision to restore these funds.

It has been 8 years since Congress passed Public Law 93-237 which gave veterans special preference for small business loans. Yet, until last September the SBA was providing only lip service to this law. Through the efforts of Mr. BOLAND and Mr. SMITH of Iowa last December, legislation providing for continuing appropriations included \$25 million specifically earmarked for Vietnam and disabled veterans. Certainly, Vietnam and disabled veterans, by virtue of their service to this country, are especially deserving of this special assistance. Considering

that their unemployment rate has hovered substantially above the national average this set-aside was not unwarranted.

Again, it is important to acknowledge the support of Messrs. BOLAND and SMITH who were quick to take action and gain House approval to restore these funds. It is also important to acknowledge the Vietnam Veterans Foundation for their efforts and struggles to see that this money was spent the way Congress intended. Without their efforts we may never have been able to take this first step in the long haul for Vietnam veterans.●

H.R. 1983, THE EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT OF 1983 (MORTGAGE FORECLOSURE ASSISTANCE FOR HOMEOWNERS)

HON. STEVE BARTLETT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I share with all Members of this body a concern for those 11 million Americans who are unemployed, some of whom face delinquencies on the mortgage payments on their homes due to unemployment. H.R. 1983, however, would further compound the problems of those unemployed homeowners rather than assist them.

In many ways, H.R. 1983 should be entitled "The Foreclosure Incentive Act of 1983." This act would encourage rather than discourage foreclosures, add to an already overburdened Federal deficit, and ignore existing remedies. The views of the minority members of the Committee on Banking, Finance and Urban Affairs have been well expressed in the minority dissent, and I joined my colleagues in that dissent. In addition to the views expressed in that dissent, I offer the following facts which detail the irresponsibility of H.R. 1983, "The Foreclosure Incentive Act of 1983."

First, this act encourages rather than discourages foreclosures. In 1982, approximately 1,230,000 home loans were delinquent in the Nation, but less than 60,000 were actually foreclosed upon—less than 5 percent of total delinquencies and less than three-tenths percent of total home mortgages. The overwhelming preponderance of delinquencies in mortgage payments do not result in foreclosures. Because this act will offer Federal money to pay for loans of delinquent payments of homeowners, lenders will be encouraged to give notice of foreclosure and homeowners will be encouraged to let Government pay on their mortgages. This act will prompt an extraordinary number of delinquencies and foreclosures.

Second, with its first year of funding of over three-fourths of \$1 billion, this

act would further drive up interest rates adding to the vicious cycle of unemployment and more foreclosures.

Third, this act ignores existing remedies. The act contains no reference of less costly and more comprehensive relief currently available under existing law in chapter 13 of title 11 of the United States Code, entitled "Adjustments of Debts of an Individual With Regular Income." Chapter 13 was enacted for the specific purpose of helping people work out their financial problems without going into bankruptcy. H.R. 1983 should require that a homeowner seek the existing relief provided by chapter 13 before qualifying for Government assistance under H.R. 1983.

Such a prerequisite would make the benefits of H.R. 1983 available to more homeowners. It would also make homeowners aware of other available aid that may best suit their financial needs. A debtor is asked to file a 1-page form under existing law of chapter 13. Upon that filing all actions of any creditor against the debtor or his property are automatically stayed until the debtor is discharged.

The trustee or judge will review with the debtor and all of his creditors the debtor's entire debt service and income capacity. Debtors have assets other than their home and mortgage such as cars, furniture, business property, credit cards, medical bills, and short-term loans. The trustee or judge will counsel the debtor about all of his financial problems and will work with creditors to effect a reasonable pay-back plan. Although chapter 13 is part of the Bankruptcy Reform Act, it is purposely not referred to as a bankruptcy. The debtor does not have to show that his entire liabilities exceed his assets and it is generally accepted that he will still be able to obtain credit after a chapter 13 plan. Further, the administrative work of the Department of Housing and Urban Development would be greatly reduced because of the research and analysis already prepared by the chapter 13 trustee judge.

A bipartisan supported amendment which will require that a homeowner seek the existing remedy of chapter 13 before qualifying for aid under H.R. 1983, will be offered by my distinguished colleagues, Hon. STEWART B. MCKINNEY of Connecticut, the ranking minority member of the Housing Subcommittee, and Hon. SAM B. HALL, Jr., of Texas, longstanding member of the Judiciary Committee, and myself.●

PROJECT HEART AND THE J. PAUL GETTY TRUST'S CENTER FOR EDUCATION IN THE ARTS

HON. RICHARD J. DURBIN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DURBIN. Mr. Speaker, some days ago, I joined with a majority of my colleagues and passed the emergency science, mathematics, and foreign language education and jobs bill. That addressed several pressing needs of American education at the elementary secondary and postsecondary levels.

I firmly believe that future generations will look back on this landmark legislation as the beginning of this Nation's return to leadership in the world economy.

But we must always keep in mind the need for a balanced education. Literature, art, and music have always played an important role in shaping our Nation and its leaders. One has only to recall the Founding Fathers, whose numbers included men like John Adams, Paul Revere, George Mason, and the incomparable Thomas Jefferson—all men with broad intellectual backgrounds.

It is with pleasure, therefore, that I call the attention of the House to a recent action of the J. Paul Getty Trust's Center for Education in the Arts.

That group recently selected seven sites from around the country to study intently as part of a national search for promising programs that address instruction in art, history, criticism, and production. Each site will be the object of a case study to examine the factors contributing to the effectiveness of the comprehensive art education programs in the district.

I am pleased to announce that one of those seven sites, the only one in the State of Illinois, is the Project HEART—Helping Education through Arts Resources for Teachers—serving Decatur and Macon County, Ill., which is located in the 20th Congressional District.

Part of the office of Howard E. Brown, the superintendent of the Macon County educational service region and one of the leading educators in Illinois, Project HEART is administered by Nancy Roucher of Decatur.

Since its inception in 1980, the program has trained over 70 classroom teachers to integrate the arts into the daily curriculum.

The principal portion of the study will focus on Centennial Lab School in Decatur, which is a pilot school under the present program. Even without the Project HEART program, Centennial is a very special school.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It offers an unstructured, individualized learning program that, under the strong and dedicated leadership of Principal Patricia Tingle, has avoided the pitfalls that countless programs of a similar nature around the country have fallen into.

A smaller portion of the study will focus on Columbia Middle School in Champaign, which has a program similar to Centennial's.

It is no secret that Decatur is like too many other cities around our country today, suffering under the unremitting pressure of high unemployment and bleak economic prospects.

But if this Nation is to get moving again, the impetus must come, in large part, from education. I think the judgment of the Getty Trust clearly indicates that Decatur and Macon County public schools are moving in the right direction.

And it is also clear that under the leadership of Howard Brown, Nancy Roucher, Patricia Tingle, and many others, Decatur schools are striving toward the classical goal of education—the education of the total individual.

By this approach, they are insuring that coming generations that will produce their own Adamsses and Jeffersons will share with their illustrious forefathers an appreciation for learning and beauty.●

A TRIBUTE TO COACH EDDIE ROBINSON

HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, recently the citizens of Grambling and Ruston, La., celebrated Coach Eddie Robinson Day. The following poem was written as a tribute to him by the president of the Grambling University Alumni Association.

COACH EDDIE ROBINSON

They call this man the legend.
In some circles, they say he's a genius and a very precious friend.

They call this man a born winner,
No less so than the mighty Malcolm, Muhammad Ali and George Steinbrenner.
There are those who say he's a humanitarian.

Both a gentleman and a gentle man.
There are those who think he's a prophet
A man the world will never forget.

Many call the man a mentor, a master, a miracle and a model

They say he's a great teacher, a challenger, a victor and a scholar.

He's shared our hopes, our dreams, our aspirations for over forty years

Bringing us many, many good cheers.

Others say he's a diplomat, a top statesman, a good and decent man.

A molder of many of fine GSU man, as well as a GSU woman.

His praises all over people sing.

Saying he's a man of great vision, compassion, sharp wit and everything.

There are even those who say, he's kind of man who would be king.

They say he's a man of substance—the kind you just don't find everyday.

They add character, integrity and quality—a total man, they say.

He gives his best to perfect every athlete
So each one can graduate, as well as in football compete.

They say he's the Grambling Tiger coach who is warm, sincere, dedicated, caring and a beautiful human being.

Oh, go on and look around you, another like him you won't be seeing.

No living man or woman has surpassed his accomplishment

A real touch of class they say is this tall, tan and terrific gent.

Off to the pros, many of his peers have run
While he stayed on at dear ole Grambling to become number one.

Rob, you know, too often we go off into the world in search of acres and acres of diamonds, only to find, we've got the most beautiful, precious jewel in our own back yard.

We're glad that we have you.

In the hearts and minds of Gramblinites throughout the world who know and love you, no matter what the record keepers say,

You're second to no one and you'll always be our number one

This year, next year and forever, too.

We cherish you. We revere you. We salute you. We love you.

Because of this strange malady called my sex,

I would never be allowed to umpire in the NFL or the virgin USFL for that matter—

Still on behalf of Gramblinites, I call them as I see them and believe me, I see them as they are.

We could search the wide world over—Eddie Robinson would still be our Super Star.

"May the Force be with you."●

SHOULD NATURAL GAS BE DECONTROLLED?

HON. THOMAS A. DASCHLE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. Speaker, in the mail of Tuesday, March 15, my office received 10 copies of a glossy, four-page, multicolored article published by the Pennzoil Co. The text of this article was an interview with J. Hugh Liedtke, chairman of Pennzoil. In the interview, Chairman Liedtke attempts to explain to all of us who simply do not understand that the only way to be fair about the natural gas situation is to immediately decontrol all natural gas prices, and exempt the oil and gas industry from any taxation on the windfall profits they might make from this decontrol.

That is an argument which can be made, I suppose. But I would have a great deal more sympathy with the oil industry's position if it made its point

in a less ostentatious, and less expensive manner. If the experience of my office holds true, they mailed out over 4,000 of these expensive reprints to House offices alone; 435 letters would have done the same thing.

This is not to say, of course, that Pennzoil and the rest of the oil industry do not have a perfect right to spend their stockholders' money on anything they want to, short of criminal activity. It does make you wonder, though, whether we should really believe the poor-mouthing they do about the wretched state of their profit pictures. If they are as bad off as they say they are, and if they really need the bonanza of profits that an untaxed decontrol of natural gas would bring, this excess does seem a bit inappropriate. ●

SALVADORAN REBELS BRAG OF CUBAN TIES

HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I bring to the attention of my colleagues a March 14, 1983, news article from the Los Angeles Times entitled "Salvadoran Rebels Brag of Cuban Ties." The subtitle reads "Insurgency Part of Regional Conflict, Guerrillas Declare."

Those two headlines accurately describe the article wherein the Salvadoran guerrillas describe their ties to Cuba and Nicaragua and speak of a regional conflict.

To quote the article:

The broadcast, transmitted from a secret location in neighboring Nicaragua whose Marxist-led Sandinista regime has allowed the Salvadoran guerrillas to establish their headquarters in Managua—also boasted that the rebels have imported arms through all routes that we could and that we have used all of Central America and other countries for that purpose.

The broadcast appeared to support charges made by the Reagan administration that the insurgency is at least encouraged and armed, if not directed, by the Soviet Union, Cuba, and Nicaragua and is aimed at toppling one moderate government after another throughout the region.

The article follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times, Mar. 14, 1983]

SALVADORAN REBELS BRAG OF CUBAN TIES (By David Wood)

WASHINGTON.—El Salvador's leftist guerrilla movement boasted Sunday of its close ties to Cuba and Nicaragua and declared that it sees its struggle against the U.S.-backed government in San Salvador as part of a wider regional conflict.

A clandestine broadcast of Radio Venceremos, the voice of the five insurgent organizations pressing embattled government troops in El Salvador, declared: "We are and will continue being friends of the people and governments of Cuba and Nicaragua,

and it does not shame us. Completely to the contrary, we are proud to maintain relations with those people—bastions of the anti-imperialist struggle.

"The Reagan Administration is not one to tell the FMLN (Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front) who ought to be its friends and who its enemies."

LATIN AMERICAN INTERESTS

The Radio Venceremos broadcast went on to say "our war is and will continue to be national, but . . . we view our plans in the framework of a regional conflict in which there are interests of the people of Central America, the Caribbean and Latin America."

The broadcast, transmitted from a secret location in neighboring Nicaragua—whose Marxist-led Sandinista regime has allowed the Salvadoran guerrillas to establish their headquarters in Managua—also boasted that the rebels have imported arms "through all routes that we could" and that "we have used all of Central America and other countries" for that purpose.

The broadcast appeared to support charges made by the Reagan Administration that the insurgency is at least encouraged and armed, if not directed, by the Soviet Union, Cuba and Nicaragua and is aimed at toppling one moderate government after another throughout the region.

ECHO OF DOMINO THEORY

The State Department's Latin America analysts could not immediately explain why the guerrilla movement would suggest that the Salvadoran conflict is part of a regional conflict, thus subscribing, in effect, to the "domino theory" embraced by the White House. The analysts indicated that the guerrillas have not previously characterized the conflict as regional in nature.

The broadcast also appeared to undercut congressmen and others critical of the Administration's policy who have argued that the guerrilla movement seeks only the establishment of social justice in El Salvador. ●

AL LOWENSTEIN

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 16, 1983

● Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago we began suffering the incalculable loss of our colleague, Al Lowenstein:

AL LOWENSTEIN

"Our citizens attend both to public and private duties, and do not allow absorption in their own various affairs to interfere with their knowledge of the city's. We differ from other states in regarding the man who holds aloof from public life not as 'quiet' but as useless." Thus spoke Pericles in the funeral oration that has come to represent the meaning of genuine citizenship and life within the polity.

Allard K. Lowenstein, as much as any man in the half century he lived, before his idiotic death on March 14 at the hands of a presumably crazed protegee, lived the vision set forth 2,500 years ago. Much that was good about the 1960s, especially the heightened sensitivity to injustice and suffering, was in a significant sense his handiwork, or was nourished by his participation, for the most enduring memory of Al to many of his

friends is his constant crisscrossing of the country (and often the world) in an effort to inform people and awaken their own sense of public passion. He called into being an entire army of students who made their indelible mark on American life. Although most of the newspaper articles after his death properly referred to his key role in the 1968 "Dump Johnson" movement, it is well to recall that the 1964 Freedom Summer in Mississippi was also heavily influenced by his vision and energy.

Although Lowenstein became well known in the 1960s, he had been an active participant in public affairs ever since his college days at the University of North Carolina in the late 1940s. And his polity was the entire world. In the 1950s he was one of the relatively few Americans who maintained active interest in Spanish resistance to Franco, and he developed a first-hand familiarity with the struggle of South African blacks in their search for justice. For Al, the '60s were different only insofar as his audience was wider and more receptive to his views. And, when the '60s disintegrated into the aloofness from public life of the mid-'70s, Al remained faithful to the Periclean vision. He allowed himself to look foolish to the sophisticated as he ran futile races for public office following his defeat in 1970 after one term in the House of Representatives. His foolishness, if such it was, was his continued belief that individuals working together could make a difference and that the public forum—the agora of Pericles's city—was the place for one who would live his life to the fullest. His was not the politics of pollsters and advance-men and -women; perhaps we would have been better off had he been less idealistic about us, for then at least he might have been elected, but that was not to be.

Al Lowenstein's death leaves us all poor. We will miss his wise voice, so brutally silenced, in our American agora.

[From the National Review, Apr. 4, 1980]

ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, RIP

(Remarks at the Memorial Service for Allard Lowenstein, Mar. 18, 1980, by WFB)

Possibly, as a dissenter, my own experience with him was unique, in that we conservatives did not generally endorse his political prescriptions. So that we were, presumptively, opponents of Al Lowenstein, in those straitened chambers in which we spend, and misspend, so much of our lives. It was his genius that so many of those he touched—generally arriving a half-hour late—discovered intuitively the underlying communion. He was, in our time, the original activist, such was his impatience with the sluggishness of justice; so that his rhythms were more often than not disharmonious with those that govern the practical, banalistic councils of this world. His habits were appropriately disarrayed. He was late to breakfast, to his appointments; late in announcing his sequential availability for public service. He was punctual only in registering (though often under-age) for service in any army that conceived itself bound to righteousness.

How did he live such a life, so hectic with public concern, while preoccupying himself so fully with individual human beings: whose torments, never mind their singularity, he adopted as his own, with the passion that some give only to the universal? Eleanor Roosevelt, James Burnham once mused, looked on all the world as her personal slum project. Although he was at home with collectivist formulations, one had the impres-

sion of Allard Lowenstein that he might be late in aborting a Third World War—because of his absorption with the problems of one sophomore. Oh, they followed him everywhere; because we experienced in him the essence of an entirely personal dedication. Of all the partisans I have known, from the furthest steppes of the spectrum, his was the most undistracted concern, not for humanity—though he was conversant with big-think idiom—but with human beings.

Those of us who dealt with him (often in those narrow passages constrained by time-clocks and fire-laws and deadlines) think back ruefully on the happy blend of purpose and carelessness with which he arranged his own career and his own schedule. A poet might be tempted to say, "If only the Lord has granted us that Allard should also have arrived late at his own assassination!"

But all his life he was felled by mysteries, dominant among them those most readily understood by more worldly men—namely, that his rhythms were not of this world. His days, foreshortened, lived out the secular dissonances. "Behold, Thou has made my days as it were a span long; and mine age is even as nothing in respect of Thee; and verily every man living is altogether vanity." The psalmist spoke of Al, on Friday last—"I became dumb, and opened not my mouth; for it was Thy doing." To those not yet dumb, the psalmist also spoke, saying, "The Lord is close to the brokenhearted; and those who are crushed in spirit, He saves." Who was the wit who said that Nature abhors a vacuum? Let Nature then fill this vacuum. That is the challenge which, bereft, the friends of Allard Lowenstein hurl up to Nature, and to Nature's God, prayerfully, demandingly, because today, Lord, our loneliness is great. ●

COMMUNISM: AT THE END OF THE BREZHNEV ERA

HON. DAN E. LUNGREN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. LUNGREN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps one of the most difficult things in life is to see things as they truly are. It has been said that lies based on half truths are more deceiving than blatant lies, which we can easily discard for their apparent falsity. By knowing and accepting that part of the message cloaked in truth, we can be deceived into accepting that part comprising the lie and which we know nothing about. Like a half truth, communism has been founded upon the ideals of common ownership of the means of production. However, wherever practiced, it has always resulted in the tyranny of a select few over entire countries.

Along these lines, Alexandr Solzhenitsyn has written an excellent article exposing communism for what it really is: The pursuit of a select few to "cling to power at any cost." Mr. Solzhenitsyn chronicles the effect communism has had on the Soviet society and economy. For example, he states that as a result of efforts to control

and regulate the agricultural economy, 2 percent of the agricultural land set aside as private plots produces one-third of the country's vegetables, eggs, milk, and meat. In this society as it is described, the individual is trapped in a life in which virtually all aspects are controlled by the state.

Without a doubt the relations presently between the Soviet Union and the United States currently stand at a critical juncture as a result of the new Soviet leadership. For this reason, it is important that we keep the lines of communication open between both countries but at the same time not overlook the history and record of communism in oppressing millions of people. For this reason, I commend Alexandr Solzhenitsyn's article, which appeared in the January 21, 1983, National Review, to my colleagues in the House of Representatives. The article follows:

[From the National Review, Jan. 21, 1983]

COMMUNISM: AT THE END OF THE BREZHNEV ERA

(By Alexandr Solzhenitsyn)

The Soviet Union of today serves as an example of what Communism does to all countries and to all peoples that fall under its control. The differences from country to country are of secondary importance; the dominant features of the process are everywhere alike.

The first act of the Communists upon coming to power in Russia in 1917 was to hand Germany 25, 30, 40 per cent of Russia's territory, whatever it took to buy Germany off, just so long as the Communists could retain control over the rest. (This supreme Communist principle—to cling to power at any cost, even if it spells ruin to one's country, one's people, and to neighboring peoples—manifests itself with steely consistency from Lenin to Brezhnev; here too Stalin was merely Lenin brought to a logical conclusion.) Immediately thereafter the Communists launched a civil war on the home front in order to destroy not only their military enemies, but every opponent in every stratum of non-combatants, shooting entire villages, laying waste whole districts, and depopulating towns and provinces. Through the fault of the Communists, who appropriated even seed grain from the peasants, the famine of 1921 affected thirty million people; five million peasants died in the Volga River basin. Since then massive famines have been all too common in our land. Nineteen thirty-three brought death from hunger to another five or six million people; during the war of 1941-45 peasants resorted to eating grass-meal patties. While people were dying in the postwar famine of 1946-47, the government was exporting grain. From 1917 on, the population has never known satiety, security, or personal freedom.

It is therefore hardly surprising that in the early phases of World War II some three million soldiers surrendered to the enemy, that the people of the occupied regions awaited liberation by the invading troops, and that even in the months when the Germans' defeat had become obvious, several hundred thousand Soviet citizens from outside the country alone volunteered for the Liberation Army against Stalin. However, Hitler was waging war not against

the ideological plague of Communism but to seize territory and to subjugate the peoples of the USSR. He thus forced the people, as they defended themselves, to defend and preserve Communism.

During the civil war of 1918-20, and with even greater intensity after its conclusion, the Communists, seeking to have no other contenders for power within the country, set about liquidating all other political parties, as well as all neutral cultural, religious, ethnic, and economic organizations. They instituted relentless mass exterminations of all who could provide even the slightest opposition to the Communist regime. Entire social strata were destroyed en masse—the nobility, the officers, the clergy, the merchants—as well as individuals who happened to stand out from the crowd or who manifested independent thinking. At first the heaviest blows fell on the largest national group, the ethnic Russians, and on their Orthodox religion; subsequent blows were just as methodically aimed at the other nationalities. By the end of the allegedly peaceful 1920s, these policies had claimed several million victims. Immediately thereafter came the annihilation of some 12 to 15 million of the most diligent peasants. The history of these successive decimations has been set forth, to the best of my ability, in "The Gulag Archipelago."

What was the point of destroying the best, the hardest-working part of the peasantry? We would understand nothing about Communism if we tried to comprehend it on the principles of normal human reason. The driving force of Communism, as it was devised by Marx, is political power, power at any cost and without regard to human losses or a people's physical deterioration. For the Communist regime, the important thing was to have no vigorous, economically independent rivals in the country; the peasantry—80 per cent of the population at the time—had to be crippled so that it would not oppose the regime. With this goal in mind, the economically ruinous collective farm system becomes politically advantageous.

The agricultural economy in a Communist country is not designed according to calculations for achieving an optimum harvest, but is determined "ideologically." It is controlled by a grotesquely bureaucratic central plan incapable of anticipating real-life circumstances or of giving thought to the future, striving only to plunder the earth, as if this same earth will not have to sustain us tomorrow. For decades on end, the regime has handed down absurd and ruinous precepts that the people have had no choice but to follow. The peasant is no longer devoted to the land and to his work as he was for centuries. What an achievement! Peasants have been numbed not indifference, obediently carrying out stupid orders, sowing and harvesting at the wrong times, irreparably turning the best meadowlands into unproductive plowed fields, cutting down forests until the rivers dry up, or draining good lakes to satisfy the formal requirements of "land reclamation." (But as they reclaim land in one spot, the same amount of acreage is abandoned elsewhere for lack of manpower.) Harvested grain and vegetables rot because of poor storage and inadequate transportation. Farm machinery rusts in the open air in winter and is soon out of commission. When there is too little time to spread all the fertilizer required by "the plan," the unused portion is burned so as to leave no trace of the infraction. Or consider this picture: a combine driver sells

seed grain on the side at cut rates instead of sowing it. No one will check to see how much he has sown, and he doesn't care what comes up. For two months every year, teenagers from city high schools and other city dwellers inexperienced in agriculture are shipped in to "help" on the dying fields: their time, quite uselessly spent, is paid for by the regular salary they continue to receive at the various institutions from which they are absent. During the past ten years imports of foodstuffs to the USSR have increased forty-fold, and there have been four poor harvests in a row—such is the worth of this system of agriculture. For decades, the state has paid artificially low, indeed contemptible, prices for the produce of collective farms, so that the labor of the farmer has in effect been appropriated without any recompense whatever. For the person weeding a field all day long, the rewards have been only the tough weeds themselves—food for his cow or goat. Having arrogated the collective farmer's full working day at no cost to itself, the state permitted him to earn a livelihood by working his tiny private plot—about three-fifths of an acre—during what was left of the day and evening. These plots consume the remaining strength of old men and women (retired collective farmers until recently drew no old-age pension; they now receive a miserly sum), of invalids, and of children. (Fifteen million rural children don't know what it means to play; rural teenagers are smaller and more disease-prone than their urban counterparts.) In terms of area, the private plots make up only 2 percent of the land under cultivation in the country, yet they generate one-third of the total production of vegetables, eggs, milk, and meat. But since up to a third of the collective farms' production of these same items is lost because of spoilage, the peasants—doubly exploited, deprived of fertilizers and modern technology, and working only with their hands, as they did long ago—produce on their private plots almost half of the USSR's supplies of those foodstuffs. But they cannot even sell all of this freely on the market. They have to give up a part to the state—formerly as a "tax," today in the form of "voluntary" sales at cut prices.

The disproportions of the Communist agricultural system speak for themselves: the entire adult rural population spends its days working on 98 percent of the cultivated area, while the remaining 2 percent is worked by invalids and children, and by adults in the evenings. But even this last refuge is being eliminated by the regime in its ideological madness: more and more collective farms (kolkhozy) have in recent years been reorganized into state farms (sovkhozy), a process that transforms the farmer into an industrial worker deprived of his private plot, these plots will therefore soon disappear altogether. Entire villages are being razed, the remnants of the peasant way of life eradicated, and the people resettled into multi-storied structures where cattle and fowl can no longer be kept. Once again the Soviet regime is demolishing its own base of production while "triumphing" ideologically.

The same type of absurdity besets the entire economy. By assuming complete control of production, the state has wrecked it. For sixty years official speeches, newspapers, and the radio have trumpeted the successes of Soviet industry; in fact it is an ailing organism, plagued by numerous afflictions that are temporarily relieved only by illegal "microcapitalistic" means (adminis-

tered in circumvention of socialist remedies). The essential goal of the Soviet economy is not economic growth, not a general increase in production, not even a rise in productivity or profit, but the functioning of a mighty military machine and the abundant provisioning of the ruling caste. The party bureaucracy is unable to organize either production or commercial distribution; it knows only how to confiscate goods that have already been produced. It is a system that cannot tolerate independence. Incapable of effective economic management, the regime substitutes coercion for leadership. The economy is fettered and hemmed in by a multitude of administrative restrictions, the aim of which is to prevent the emergence of any free social force. An obtuse extension of these rules has a deadening impact on many fruitful scientific undertakings; to offset this, key technology is either purchased or stolen in the West, and productivity rises only as a result of technical advances that have come into common use the world over. The result is foreign debts in the fantastic billions and depletion of the mineral and fuel resources that are used as payment. During their years in power, the Soviet leaders have sold or squandered reserves sufficient for their own generation and the two following generations. A great power, yet one that must import everything from electronics to grain, and that exports only its natural riches and arms, the Soviet Union has a standard of living below that of more than thirty other nations. Meanwhile, 12 percent of the state's income is derived from the sale of exorbitantly priced vodka (which brings the populace to the point of induced idiocy) and of inferior wines prepared in unsanitary conditions: the government is literally driving the people to drink in order to finance its global designs.

The central plan controlling the economy does not take into account local circumstances or concrete events, yet it must be followed in rigid detail. The result is absurdity and chaos. Local officials work full-time devising ways of resisting or circumventing the plan, risking criminal charges at every step. Construction, for example, could not proceed if the laws were adhered to strictly: neither materials nor manpower would be available. Only illicit methods work. Everyone trembles at the threat of prosecution, yet nothing whatever would get built in any other way. The restrictions hinder action to the point that industrial managers are afraid to introduce obviously advantageous new technology: that would affect the plan and disrupt the schedule; it is far less trouble to announce that it will be instituted during the next five-year plan. Bold men with initiative have here and there attempted to set up the finances at their factories so as to get around petty state regulations and to be able to pay according to the quality and quantity of work performed. The results have always been spectacular, but such managers are immediately reined in from above with new restrictions, cuts in budget allocations, and sometimes even with criminal proceedings. The emergence of free economic forces is seen as a threat to the bureaucracy's control of events.

The plan is not based on the quality of goods, nor on their variety, but on their gross value; thus whoever produces the greatest number of expensive, unnecessary, and unsalable items is "ahead" and is awarded a prize. To satisfy the plan, more timber is cut and floated downstream yearly than can later be hauled away; the rest rots. The plan means that Siberia, the richest

part of the country in energy resources, has a shortage of electric power. An outstanding black-earth region is pointlessly chosen as the site of the huge Kama industrial complex. The Baikal-Amur railway line is a high-priority "national construction project"; no resources, materials, or manpower are spared. Yet the line is exceedingly poor in quality, with settling of the roadbed and derailments, even though the cost of five million rubles per kilometer surpasses the cost of an equivalent unit of railway construction in pre-revolutionary Siberia by a factor of twenty (taking into account the changed value of the ruble).

To thousands of such examples one must add one other aspect of Communism: the mandatory system of lies. From the day the Communist system was born, one of its primary aims has been to conceal or distort what actually takes place. The effort was successful from the start, and has remained so throughout the zigs and zags of the subsequent decades, with the rest of the world actually wanting to be deceived, wishing to believe in the goodness of socialism. This led, at the launching of Stalin's first five-year plan in 1928, to the proclamation of unattainable goals for the sake of foreign prestige, goals made even less feasible by a propaganda campaign demanding "The five-year plan in four years!" Yet fulfillment of the stated objectives was required under threat of sanctions, and every level of management was left with no choice but to submit false reports, inflated figures, and claims to have accomplished what had not in fact been done at all. These inflated figures then became the basis of new plans, also unattainable, which led to new lies. By now there is half a century's worth of accumulated falsehoods. The U.S.S.R. does not publish false statistics only for foreign consumption: the leaders themselves do not know the true situation in their own country.

It goes without saying that this lunatic conduct of economic policy, which anticipates nothing but military needs and exhibits a contemptuous disregard for the everyday requirements of the populace, leads to irreparable abuse of the environment. It is the plan at any cost, no matter what may be ruined in the process, particularly if this is merely some historical site or an unsullied natural region. Numerous hydroelectric stations are being constructed across rivers in flat country, flooding cultivated fields, grasslands, and populated districts; the hastily constructed dams ruin fishing. The price of all this is far greater than the benefits in increased electric energy. Beneath the waters of such new "seas," about which, incredibly, the Communists like to boast, there now lie a dozen towns, many hundreds of villages, and valuable forests. In contrast, the highly prized Sea of Azov, which used to provide more fish than the Black, Caspian, and Baltic Seas put together, has had its water level lowered by the Volga-Don Canal and has been turned into a dump for industrial wastes. The fish population has decreased ninety- to a hundred-fold compared to pre-World War II levels.

Having ruined the European part of Russia, they are now wreaking destruction beyond the Urals, Lake Baikal, a unique formation which has withstood geological calamities for 25 million years and which used to contain the world's cleanest water, has been forever poisoned by the dumping of heavy metals and by the effluents of a cellulose factory that produces tires for long-range bombers. The hydroelectric power

station near Alma-Ata has caused half of Lake Balkhash to dry up. The attempt to cultivate the virgin lands of Kazakhstan has turned seven and a half million acres of land into desert. The Siberian forests are being cut down rapaciously, without any effort at reforestation. Inferior timbering techniques inflict permanent damage on the soil and kill off new forest growths. Incompetent construction of the Baikal-Amur railroad has doomed a wide strip of land along the roadbed, with the surface layer turning into a barren swamp; uncontrolled removal of gravel is spoiling rivers. Another huge area is now being laid waste by the frenzied construction of the natural-gas pipeline between Taimyr and Western Europe. (All of Europe, and even Japan, is helping in this project, which will certainly make use of slave labor from the camps.)

The Communist authorities are recklessly willing to pay this price in order to keep seizing new countries in Africa and Asia, countries they will ravage in the same way—just as they are plundering the oceans of the world. Half a century ago they sacrificed the peasantry to the insane concept of the collective farm—are they surprised today that the harvests are poor? In the same way they are now seeking to improve the climate: rivers flowing into the Arctic Ocean will be reversed and made to flow south—another insane project that will produce a new disaster in a few years, a disaster not limited in its impact to the Russian north alone, but with repercussions for the entire planet as the balance of the Arctic Ocean is upset. In the case of every enterprise, the plan is such that it is too time-consuming and too expensive to safeguard nature and to construct installations for purifying wastes. And so the environment deteriorates. The areas surrounding cities and industrial installations are disfigured and covered with litter; rivers are poisoned with concentrations of toxic materials that exceed the "upper permissible limit" for these substances by a factor of two or three. In the case of urban air pollution the factor is ten and in some cases even a hundred. (None of this is reported openly, since the destruction of nature and the threat to human life are classified matters in the USSR, just like everything else; those who have tried to air these issues publicly have ended up in psychiatric wards.) Lung cancer has increased twofold in our country over the last ten years. We are dying together with our natural environment.

Children with living parents grow up like orphans: because the father's salary is invariably insufficient and the mother must work, millions of children begin their lives in overcrowded day-care centers, in unhealthy and tension-filled surroundings, with inadequate supervision but with the compensation of an "ideological upbringing." Millions of them will pass their entire subsequent existence in common living quarters of this type, in trade schools and factories, with the facilities everywhere run-down and unsanitary; an early exposure to drunkenness and depravity is the norm here. Nor can a young person escape to a private apartment: he or she would be unable to get the necessary residence permit. These people are like serfs, totally dependent on their factory managers, who exploit them without limit: should they lose their job, they also lose the right to remain in that city. This state of affairs applies throughout the Soviet Union: the employer has full administrative power over his employees, and everyone everywhere, with the

partial exception of Moscow, is fully and directly dependent upon his administrative supervisor. The employee cannot present any demands and cannot leave of his own volition. Salaries are calamitously low; for a workman, they do not correspond even to a tenth of the real value of his labor. Cramped, poor-quality housing is the rule, with several unrelated families sharing a single apartment. Even decades-long employment in a single enterprise does not earn one the right to separate family quarters.

The so-called free medical care is of wretched quality, and the hospitals are squalid. The country is afflicted with mass alcoholism, and young men have a high death rate from alcohol-related accidents. The drinking problem among women is also on the rise.

Except in Moscow and Leningrad, commercial goods are of poor quality, and one must stand in long lines to get them. All sorts of items suddenly disappear from the market—soap, detergent, thread, needles, dishes, underwear, light bulbs. For 65 years the population has not received adequate nutrition or the requisite number of calories. In the provincial towns there is real hunger: no meat, fish, eggs, or milk, not even macaroni or groats are to be found. (No one has laid eyes on rice for half a century.) Many cities in recent years have instituted food rationing, and this in the absence of war or natural disaster. Nowhere else in the world do so many women work at such physically arduous tasks without mechanical aids. Aside from their jobs, Soviet women also spend more than thirty hours per week on domestic chores and standing in line. (The state actually prefers that people should be preoccupied with trying to obtain their daily bread, so that no thoughts will be left for anything else.)

The government robs the land and the people of hundreds of billions of rubles, and the oppressed populace has only one real means of resistance: it steals, in turn, its daily bread from the government. From ancient times theft was looked upon as a deadly sin in Russia, but today stealing from the government has become a common, universally understood fact of life, an act necessary for survival. Through theft the people recover part of their rights, and this form of self-defense causes tremendous harm to the government. Many items—wire, nails, machine oil, paint, fertilizer—simply cannot be purchased honestly anywhere in the country, but they can be stolen at one's place of employment and then sold on the black market. Materials, instruments, and foodstuffs worth billions of rubles are plundered on every industrial site and every collective farm, injecting more chaos into the production process. Children of collective farmers learn to steal at an early age. No one has any desire to work honestly for the benefit of a dishonest regime. No one is paid a fair wage, but neither does anyone exert himself to the fullest. This is true of the workman at the lathe, of the government official, and even of the scientist in his research institute: each and every one of them strives to rest during working hours in order to save his strength for evening "moonlighting" or other business. People work at an ever decreasing level of their capacity, and in important projects the management stimulates participation by engaging in its own form of deceiving the state: creating fictional but paying job-titles, or providing opportunities for illicit additional earnings.

The harshness of life, the constant feeling of hunger, cramped living quarters, and lack

of time all combine to deprive women of the strength to raise children, which leads to a large number of abortions. Among the Slavic peoples in the USSR, there are four abortions for every live birth. Frequent abortions cause infertility and miscarriages; the number of the latter has been growing at 6 to 7 percent yearly. Poor nourishment of mothers-to-be, alcoholism among women, inferior medical care, and polluted air in the cities have contributed to a rising rate of infant mortality; children who do survive are sickly, and suffer increasingly from genetic defects. The USSR today has a falling birth rate, a rising mortality rate, and a decreasing life expectancy. Calculations made before 1917, based on the birth rate of that time, projected a population of 400 million by 1985; the population today is 266 million. We are witnessing a period of irreversible population decline among the Slavic peoples in the USSR. Given the rising infertility among women in their child-bearing years and the factor of genetic inertia, the demographic slide of the Russians probably could not be arrested in the next hundred years even by beneficial political and social changes.

Above a crushed populace looms the tyrannical apparatus of the party and state, which, with its attendant machinery for propaganda and repression, numbers three million persons. This is a caste supplied in abundance with every privilege—special stores (where the highest-quality goods are sold at low prices), secret payments of money untouched by taxes, the best houses and apartments, special medical facilities, free access to health resorts, a power over the population that has virtually no legal restraints—but a caste that pays for these benefits with unquestioning and obsequious service. A member of this caste must ignore the suffering of his own people, present, past, and future: he maintains his position only so long as he is faithful to the system; he is expelled at the slightest hint of disloyalty. At the center of this group is an oligarchy of party functionaries, about a hundred thousand strong, whose desires need have no limit whatever (the ruling class of Old Russia did not live as well) and whose children have access to the same privileges, so that the oligarchy becomes hereditary.

The Soviet leaders have more than satisfied their personal needs in terms of power, veneration, and property, why, then, should they strive to overrun the world? Yet that is precisely what the Communist madness leads them to do, for they too are prisoners of an ideological system. Unrestricted finances, military might, international politics—all this is in their hands, but the West hopes in vain that the replacement of one leader by another will bring about a mellowing of the system. The Communist government has already lasted an excessively long time in terms of an individual life span; it has sucked the life out of its subject peoples and has corrupted and deadened the spirit by compulsory lies. The all-permeating lie is the most burdensome trait of the regime. For more than half a century, millions of people have been forced to take part in the elaborate shams of "socialist competition" and "Communist subbotniki" (i.e., work without pay on one's day off), in humiliating meetings, and in the crude inculcation of lies that occurs at compulsory political sessions after work. As in the early years of Communist rule, popular disturbances are crushed quickly and with great brutality (e.g., the uprisings in Novocherkassk. Aleksandrov, Murom, Krasnodar), the mutiny on

a Baltic destroyer; the strikes in Perm and in several cities on the Volga). The masses are overcome by despondency and indifference; the impotence you feel when you watch your country being destroyed and defiled for two-thirds of a century. At times the suppressed frustration breaks through in the form of attacks on official Soviet monuments.

Religion and national consciousness are persecuted with particular relentlessness, as the regime's main enemies. Religious education of children is sternly proscribed. Each religion feels the pressure of the throttling noose. In the Baltic states Catholic priests are treacherously killed. Children are taken away from Baptists and Pentecostals and the parents thrown in prison. Harsh prison terms are handed out to Orthodox Christians: e.g., Father Gleb Yakunin; members of the seminary of Ogorodnikov and Poreh; and Krakhmalnikova, the publisher of samizdat anthologies of Christian readings. But the most crushing (and repeated) prison terms are reserved for those who express the aspirations of any national group under Soviet rule. Simple charity accorded to the families of prisoners by the Russian Social Fund (an organization funded by royalties from the sale of "The Gulag Archipelago" and augmented by collections within the USSR) is punished by arrest and imprisonment.

In its inhumanity, Communism has no historical precedent; before the twentieth century no country experienced anything like it, but today more than twenty lands are oppressed by it. Many times it seemed ready to collapse here or there, but it has always managed to keep its balance, while its powerful enemies, on the contrary, have been destroyed. Communism is a trap from which no nation has ever escaped. No personal tyranny can compare with ideological Communism, since every personal tyrant attains a limit of power that satisfies him. But no single country is enough to satisfy a totalitarian Communist regime. Communism is a type of virtually incomprehensible regime that is not interested in the flourishing of a country, or in the health and welfare of its people. On the contrary, Communism sacrifices both people and country to achieve its external goals.

The main goal of Communism is an irrational and fanatical urge to swallow the maximum amount of external territory and population, with the ideal limit being the entire planet. Under Communism a country is never prepared for a long and healthy economic existence. But it is always ready to strike, to seize, and to expand militarily—that is an indispensable mode of Communist existence. Thus Communist China (which is no longer the true historical China), despite its military weakness, has given organizational and material assistance to murderers—the Khmer Rouge—and has tried to ignite revolution in Indonesia. North Korea invaded the South and has been frustrated in its murderous designs only by the presence of American troops. And Vietnam, bled white in its recent victorious struggle with America, has already plunged into Cambodia; Cuba is invading Latin America and Africa; Ethiopia makes war on Eritrea; South Yemen attacks North Yemen; Angola is involved in Namibia. And it is symptomatic that Communist imperialism (in contrast to the earlier colonial variety) does not even benefit or enrich the nation that it impels to commit aggression; in fact, this is the nation it ruins first.

It is a dangerous illusion to draw distinctions between "better" and "worse" Communisms, between more peace-loving and more aggressive kinds. They are all inimical to humanity, and if one seems restrained in its behavior, this is merely because it has not yet gained military strength. If we know next to nothing about the forced-labor camps in China, North Korea, or Vietnam, this means only that people are held there in even harsher conditions than in Soviet camps; no individual and no information has been allowed to slip out. But we do know that in Addis Ababa the bodies of executed schoolboys are stacked up in rows. And priests are shot in both Albania and Angola. In all Communist states the form of property ownership is not rational or practical but "ideological." Marxism is hostile to the physical existence and the spiritual essence of every nation. It is futile to hope that a compromise with Communism will be found, or that relations will be improved by concessions and trade.

Communism is the denial of life; it is a fatal disease of a nation and the death of all humanity. And there is no nation on earth that has immunity against Communism.

There has been a great deal of excitement in the West in connection with the change of leadership in the Soviet Union, and, naturally, there are great hopes. And just as naturally, a few small but seemingly meaningful steps taken by the new leadership, particularly in the area of intellectual freedom and emigration, would be enough to "signal" that everything is improving. A survey of Soviet reality shows, however, that neither a change of leadership nor dozens of symbolic gestures could improve the situation. This can only be achieved if the life of the nation is restored to health in a fundamental way.

To improve or to correct Communism is not feasible. Communism can only be done away with—by the joint efforts of the many peoples oppressed by it. ●

A SALUTE TO HENRY G. COLE

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to join with the Cleveland Society of Poles in congratulating the distinguished recipient of the Good Joe of 1983 Award, Mr. Henry G. Cole. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, March 19, in Cleveland, Mr. Henry Cole will be presented with the highest award bestowed by the society, the "Cleveland Society Heritage Award" at the Good Joe Banquet.

On behalf of the residents of Ohio's 21st Congressional District, I extend my best wishes on this significant occasion to Mr. Cole and his family. I also ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in paying tribute to Mr. Cole and his contributions to the people of the Cleveland metropolitan area.

Mr. Speaker, the Cleveland Society Heritage Award is given annually to one of the members of the society who has exhibited exceptional efforts in fostering the cultural heritage of Poland and promoting these principles

of American citizenship. Mr. Cole's professional and community associations attest to the fact that he exemplifies, in every way, these notable ideals.

Mr. Speaker, we need only to look at Mr. Cole's successful professional career and community service record to understand the reason why he was selected as this year's recipient of the Cleveland society's most coveted award. At this juncture, I would like to share some of that information with my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker, after graduating from the Ohio Northern University with a degree in pharmacy in 1930, Mr. Cole purchased the Cantius Pharmacy located on the near west side of Cleveland. For over 50 years, he has operated the pharmacy which has been a symbol of quality service and friendliness to the customers and area residents. Because of his success with his pharmacy and concern for area residents, he is held in the highest esteem by all of those who know him.

Mr. Speaker, in every way, he has been a role model for people in the community and for his family. His three children have followed in his footsteps and received degrees in pharmacy.

Mr. Cole has distinguished himself in the professional organizations in which he holds membership. He is an active member of the Cleveland Academy of Pharmacy, Ohio State Pharmaceutical Association, and the National Association of Retail Druggists.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, he is considered to be a leader by his associates in the Cleveland Society of Poles. For many years, he has been a catalyst for positive action within this group. Currently, he serves as the chairman of the health and services committee for the society.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I again congratulate Henry G. Cole on his significant occasion. He is deserving of this honor because of his tireless efforts professionally and within the community. On behalf of all of the residents of the 21st Congressional District of Ohio, I salute Henry G. Cole, the Cleveland society's "Good Joe of 1983." ●

NEWELL SHARKEY: MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with a great deal of pleasure that I bring to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives a constituent in my district of noted distinction and achievement who is being honored as Man of the Year by the Hi-

bernian Club, the largest organization of Irish heritage in San Mateo County, Calif.

On March 11 friends and admirers of Newell Sharkey gathered to pay tribute to this fine and talented citizen on the occasion of the Hibernian Club's 33d annual Saint Patrick's luncheon and on the occasion of Mr. Sharkey's 80th year. Mr. Sharkey was an original founder of the Hibernian Club when it came into existence 33 years ago. While this in itself is reason enough for this group to call attention to this remarkable man during this landmark year of his life, it is also an appropriate occasion to shed a more complete light on the lifetime of accomplishments of a dedicated and good-hearted gentleman.

Mr. Sharkey's influence in San Mateo County began in the city of San Carlos in 1927 and has never ended. From owner of the city's only service station to the city's chief volunteer cameraman to volunteer firefighter to city council member and mayor and to hours upon hours of charity work, he has worked tirelessly and well.

The location of his service station on one of the busiest intersections of what was then the hamlet of San Carlos afforded Mr. Sharkey the view of many of the area's automobile accidents. Camera in hand, he would be the first on the scene to assist and to record the event. His photographs would aid police investigations. Soon local newspapers would ask to print copies of his photos for their editions. His photo coverage expanded to the town's fires and it was not long before he became known as the San Carlos Shutterbug.

Later Mr. Sharkey became one of the city's original firefighters. His 26-year career, which was strictly volunteer, ended abruptly when then Fire Captain Sharkey received a broken leg while fighting a chickenhouse blaze. That did not stop him from his energetic devotion to public service, however. In 1948 he was appointed to the San Carlos City Council in what was now becoming a fast-growing and vital cog in the chain of cities on the San Francisco Peninsula. Mr. Sharkey was held in such high esteem by his colleagues on the city council that it was not long before he was their unanimous choice for mayor. He became known around town as Mr. San Carlos.

Throughout the years he was one of the original organizers of the Chickens Ball, one of the most successful and longstanding public service fundraisers in the State. He has been a member of the Lions Club for 33 years and was president of the chamber of commerce.

Mr. Sharkey's brand of unending dedication to people and to the public is rare. It is a tremendous privilege to be acquainted with Mr. Sharkey. I also salute him as Man of the Year.●

TRIBUTE TO JOE FITZSIMMONS

HON. EDWARD R. MADIGAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. MADIGAN. Mr. Speaker, I was recently saddened to learn of the untimely death of a prominent citizen of my hometown of Lincoln, Ill. Joe Fitzsimmons was every inch as good an Irish politician as one would expect to find in Boston. He was a Democrat elected to the city council by Republicans representing the ward in which I grew up. Like yourself, he was an American first and a Democrat second and went out of his way to help people regardless of their political affiliation. His hometown never had a stronger booster, and if a Republican was running for the legislature, or for Congress, and was a hometown boy, he knew he would have at least one Democrat vote. Fitz once offered to go into the Republican primary to help me, and it would have placed him in great jeopardy to do so. He said if he could not help his friends, then nothing else would really matter very much. Joe will be missed by a great many people. I am inserting a copy of an article about Fitz that appeared in the Lincoln Courier.

THE HOT CORNER (By Dick Huston)

What manner of a man was Joe Fitzsimmons, the longtime Lincoln High fan whose bigger-than-his-body heart quit on him Tuesday morning?

He was a Democrat that a Republican could like, an Irishman that an Englishman could like, and a public servant that even Senator William Proxmire of Wisconsin could respect. In short, like Willa Cather's "Neighbor Rosicky," his secret was that he loved people.

Joe rooted for his Railer basketball team in games won and games lost, in winning streaks and in losing streaks, in winning seasons and in losing seasons. He treated the Railers the same way he treated his family, friends and God—with loyalty.

Joe was well known for his Irish sense of humor. He was quick-witted, but his wit sprung from his ability to see the incongruity in situations or the lack of proportion in situations. He could use the putdown, but his humor never was sarcastic for sarcasm's sake. Joe never hesitated to turn his humor on himself whether it was in a story or in a quip. He once said, "If you can't take it, then don't dish it out." Anyone who ever engaged Joe in a battle of wits would suffer if unarmed.

Joe had one pet peeve: people who wouldn't dress up to attend Sunday church services. He once commented, "If you were going to the boss's house, the governor's mansion or the White House, you'd be pretty fussy about your grooming. What's more important than going into God's House?"

Fitz's sense of humor didn't desert him, even on his deathbed. His view on death probably accounted for the fact that he could joke even to the end. Joe once said after the death of a loved one, "If we believe

in Heaven and if we believe that Heaven is a happier place than earth, why should we wish anyone back here? Wouldn't we want them to be happy in Heaven? If we honestly believe that a good person goes to Heaven, then we're sorry really for ourselves when he or she is gone. Oh, sure, the grief is real, but so is the happiness."

If Joe could read this column, he'd exclaim, "Good night, it's a good thing that I'm gone or my friends would accuse me of writing it!" Joe, you did write this column with your personal example.●

UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION FOR EX-SERVICEMEN

HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. WILLIAMS of Montana. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to clarify the provisions of unemployment compensation regarding ex-servicemen.

As of this January, servicemen are included in the unemployment figures. They are now counted as members of the labor force. Our responsibility to clear up the inequities are now even clearer.

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 changed the unemployment compensation law to bar ex-service members who voluntarily leave the service from collecting benefits.

The Miscellaneous Revenue Act, which was enacted in October 1982, requalified ex-service members with certain limitations. Unfortunately, during compromises worked out by House Ways and Means and Senate Finance, certain ex-service members, because of their discharge dates, remained ineligible.

As you know, unemployment benefits are calculated according to a base period which ordinarily is computed from the time a claim is made. This is usually right after separation from a job. The base period is the first four out of the last five completed calendar quarters. In order to collect, a claimant must have at least 20 weeks of work and \$1,000 in earnings during his or her base period.

An ex-service member who was discharged in August 1981 was not eligible for unemployment benefit due to the reconciliation bill. With the Miscellaneous Revenue Act. However, he or she could again claim benefits as of the effective date of the new law, October 1982. The bad news is that the base period, and this was apparently intentional in the act, must be calculated from the date of enactment—October 1982—instead of from the individual's discharge date. If the ex-service member has not worked since his or her discharge—certainly possible or even likely in this recession—many of

the months in the base period will have shown no earnings.

As an example, a base period calculated from October 1982 runs back to June 1981. If the service member was discharged in August 1981 and has not worked since, he or she will have had earnings only in June, July, and whatever portion of August he or she was still in the service. Although this still may amount to over \$1,000 in earnings, the 20-week requirement cannot be met. The number of people affected by this is small. Only six Montanans have discharge dates which so disqualify them. It is a blatantly unfair situation, and it is hypocritical that the administration panders to servicemen and veterans and then double-crosses them at every turn.

The only way this built-in ineligibility can be corrected is through legislation. Since the gap was intentional on the part of the committees, it would be difficult to pass. This bill would help younger veterans, however. The administration, incidentally, steadfastly continues to oppose UI benefits for voluntary separations. Whether or not one believes ex-service members should receive UI, restoring it for some and not for others on the basis of discharge dates is inconsistent.

My bill would rectify these inconsistencies.●

THE SOVIETS: NEW THREATS AGAINST AMERICA

HON. WM. S. BROOMFIELD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. BROOMFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues a few thoughts about the Soviet Union and their real intentions in the world. I believe that many of you will agree with me in saying that duplicity and threats characterize Soviet behavior in the international arena.

During the so-called period of détente, the United States honestly complied both with the letter and the spirit of the understanding. We reduced American military expenditures and weapons modernization efforts. Our foreign policy became almost passive and inactive.

The Soviets, on the other hand, modernized weapons systems and introduced new ones. Their military budgets steadily grew. Their long-range and more aggressive foreign policy brought Soviet involvement and influence in Southeast Asia, Central America, Africa, and the Middle East. Needless to say, their Cuban surrogates furthered the Soviets' objectives in many countries. Afghanistan and Poland are recent examples of the Soviets' expansionist policies. Unfortunately, détente is dead. Soviet duplicity killed it.

During the period of détente, a rough nuclear weapons parity existed in Europe. While the Soviets talked peace, and stressed the importance of harmony in international relations, they installed over 300 medium-range theater missiles in Europe. This effectively destabilized the previous balance of forces in the area. This deployment worried both the United States and our NATO partners.

In response to this new threat, NATO announced plans to deploy U.S. Pershing and cruise missiles in 1979. The Soviets immediately began a massive disinformation and propaganda campaign directed against this planned effort. The Soviets painted themselves as peace-loving while describing NATO and the United States as warmongers who would bring about the end of the world. The freeze movement quickly spread throughout Europe to the United States.

Recently, the Soviets directed a wilting propaganda barrage at Germany just prior to the recent election. When the Kremlin failed to sway the German people, they resorted to hard threats and intimidating statements against Germany and NATO itself. Even Japan, with modest military capability, was subjected to a formidable threat by the Soviets threatening to put Japan in its place if it did not behave.

To deflect attention away from the real issues, Soviet SS-20's in Europe and the Soviets' refusal to remove these weapons of destruction, the Kremlin began raising the tension level between the East and West. They accused the United States of stalling in the INF talks and of being intransigent.

In early March, Soviet Central Committee Deputy Chief Zagladin said that if the Pershing and cruise missiles were deployed, the Soviets would "deploy missiles equivalent to Pershing IIs with an equally rapid flight time in the vicinity of the United States."

On Swedish television, Soviet General Chervov said that the so-called Soviet countermeasures would not only affect those European states where missiles are sighted, but U.S. territory as well.

Let us not be duped by the Soviets' war of words. Let their actions be testimony to their real intentions in the world. In spite of their promises during détente, they increased their military prowess. In spite of their claims to want peace, they invaded Afghanistan. In spite of their statements regarding arms parity in Europe, they deployed SS-20's.

During the House debate on the nuclear freeze question, they skillfully threatened to deploy missiles near our shores if we fail to acquiesce. Let us not be swayed by their well-orchestrated disinformation and propaganda ef-

forts. Let us vote to keep America and our allies strong.●

IMPORTANCE OF HISTORY

HON. FRANK R. WOLF

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. WOLF. Mr. Speaker, the theme of the U.S. Capitol Historical Society's symposium to be held on March 17 and 18 is "Peace and the Peacemakers: The Treaty of 1783."

As part of this program awards will be presented to teachers and students selected from the nearby school jurisdictions in the District of Columbia, Maryland, and Virginia. To be recognized will be outstanding teacher-historians, outstanding graduating seniors in the area of historical studies, and those teachers who most influenced the students selected. I am proud that the following individuals from the 10th Congressional District which I represent will be honored:

Teacher-historian: John Gott, Langley High School.

Students: Tracy McGrath, Loudoun Valley High School and John Ralph Gaskins, Wakefield High School.

Guest teachers: Richard T. Gillespie, Loudoun Valley High School and William Evinger, Wakefield High School.

I would also like to commend Mr. Fred Schwengel, president U.S. Capitol Historical Society for conducting such a symposium which focuses attention on the importance of history.●

EL SALVADOR GUERRILLA TIES TO CUBA AND NICARAGUA

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, since many American people, including some of my colleagues, have long doubted the nature of guerrilla support in El Salvador and their regional intentions, I thought it appropriate to include this news story which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, March 15, 1983. The story quotes a radio broadcast from the guerrillas which shows their determination to maintain ties to Cuba and Nicaragua.

LEFTIST GUERRILLAS IN EL SALVADOR DEFEND CUBA TIES

(By Christopher Dickey)

SAN SALVADOR, March 13—El Salvador's guerrillas, in a defiant response to President Reagan's speech last week urging an expansion of the U.S. commitment to the government they are fighting, have reaffirmed their determination to maintain ties to Cuba and Nicaragua.

In a broadcast last night, they also threatened "within that context" an "open regionalization" of their war if the Reagan administration continued to broaden its support for the faltering Salvadoran government.

In a broadcast over their clandestine Radio Venceremos, the rebels said: "We are and will continue being friends of the people and governments of Cuba and Nicaragua, and it does not shame us. Completely to the contrary, we are proud to maintain relations with those people—bastions of the anti-imperialist struggle. The Reagan administration is not one to tell the FMLN [Farabundo Marti National Liberation Front] who ought to be its friends and who its enemies." The statement made no effort to deny receiving Cuban and Nicaraguan support as the rebels have in the past.

The broadcast came as the Reagan administration is planning \$110 million in military and \$168 million in economic assistance this year to help launch some of the most ambitious counterinsurgency training and operations programs of the 2½-year-old war.

Despite major questions about the competence and human rights records of the government here, Reagan justified the emergency support by pointing to the need to defeat "extremists with Cuban-Soviet support" that comes to them by way of "Marxist Nicaragua." He said the leftist forces would threaten U.S. security interests.

The rebels' broadcast defended their "right" to get arms anywhere. While insisting that their main headquarters are inside the country, along with their radio transmitter, they admitted to having "important missions" outside El Salvador.

We have carried out important logistical operations of a clandestine character with which we have armed and munitioned our forces for a long time. We have carried out these operations by all the courses we could, and we have used all Central America and other countries for them," the broadcast said.

As Washington has raised its commitment in the region during the past month, the Nicaraguans also have reaffirmed their close ties, if not their concrete material support, with the Salvadoran rebels.

The Sandinista leaders in Managua feel under mounting pressure from a rebellion that reportedly receives covert funding from Washington on the basis that such action helps "interdict" arms supplies to the Salvadoran guerrillas. Speaking March 3 at a funeral for 17 adolescent Sandinistas killed by counterrevolutionaries, Nicaraguan commander Bayardo Arce warned that his party's "internationalism will not bend" and that "while Salvadorans are fighting to win their liberty Nicaragua will maintain its solidarity."

The guerrillas here said in their broadcast last night that their war "is and will continue being national, but we are not so naive as not to know that we cannot and ought not fail to place our plans in the framework of a regional conflict" in which the future of Central America is at stake.

They added that they are not closely tied to the Soviet Union but said that is because "unfortunately it is very far away."

The pace of the war here has stepped up dramatically since the guerrillas began a sustained offensive in October. The Salvadoran government and the White House maintain that the rebels use ammunition, if not guns, smuggled in from Nicaragua.

In a response that some military observers here see as virtually a last-ditch effort to reverse rebel momentum, the United States

and the Salvadoran government are pushing ahead with an ambitious, coordinated program of military and civic action planned for some of El Salvador's battered, guerrilla-dominated eastern provinces.

Modeled broadly on the program of Civil Operations and Rural Development Support (CORDS) created in Vietnam during the 1960s, but refined and scaled down for implementation here, it is thus far referred to only as "the plan" and is to be carried out in four stages.

The number of U.S. military advisers required is not likely to remain below the administration's self-imposed limit of 55 men, according to a military observer. He added that the American presence in the countryside probably will grow with the addition of more U.S. Agency for International Development employees.

There is no set timetable as yet, but because of crop cycles in the San Vicente and Usulután areas where the new initiative is expected to be launched, it should be under way no later than mid-summer.

According to military sources, the first stage, planning, is intended to integrate and coordinate the American and Salvadoran personnel working on the program as they hammer out its details. The second stage is a large-scale military sweep to clean out guerrilla concentrations. Salvadoran civilian assistance agencies trained to deal with everything from road repair to refugee assistance and public health are supposed to follow the Army's offensive. The plan calls for the military command staff to be advised by at least five American soldiers while another 10 to 15 are devoted to the task of "upgrading the training" of the troops in the operations area, a military source said.

In the third phase, the military role is supposed to subside while a renewed civilian infrastructure takes hold in these areas long dominated by the rebels. The fourth stage sees the withdrawal of all but a small contingent of soldiers while the main force moves on to new target areas. The strategy is designed to sidestep longstanding problems with senior Salvadoran military commanders who are ill-trained and ill-disposed to adopt the kind of political, social and military counterinsurgency tactics advocated by the U.S. Embassy.

Military sources here anticipate problems with the paramilitary forces needed to supply security in the latter phases of the program. Such groups have been responsible for many of the atrocities in the countryside that give this government a notorious human rights record.

There are also questions about how effectively the guerrillas can be cleaned out in the first place, since previous sweeps rarely have pushed rebels out of their stronghold for more than a few weeks.

I further commend to my colleagues another article on this issue published in the Los Angeles Times of March 15, 1983, which was inserted in the Extension of Remarks section by my colleague from California, the Honorable

ROBERT LAGOMARSINO.●

RAISING TAXES WILL NOT CURE DEFICIT CRISIS

HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, Nick Poulos, business editor of the Atlanta Journal and the Atlanta Constitution, has written an article I would like to share with my distinguished colleagues. The article highlights the fact that raising taxes will be far more destructive to our economy than having a large national deficit. In fact, as many of us know, we need to focus on getting the economy healthy and getting people back to work and at least two-thirds of the deficit will take care of itself. Raising taxes, however, will cripple the economic recovery, increase unemployment, and increase the deficit in the long run. We all recognize these facts, and I would like to commend Mr. Poulos for this article on the issue.

[From the Atlanta Constitution, Mar. 15, 1983]

ECONOMIST SAYS DEFICITS AREN'T CRITICAL FACTOR

(By Nick Poulos)

Unlike a number of his fellow economists, Robert R. Davis, vice president of Chicago's Harris Bank, isn't particularly worried about the impact of the big federal budget deficits on interest and inflation rates.

Davis readily acknowledges that budget deficits do affect interest rates to some degree. But he asserts that the effect is small compared with impact of rising inflation.

"In the last seven months, the deficit has been the largest in history, but there has been a substantial decline in interest rates during the period," he said in an interview.

Davis, a native of Atlanta, said he expects that economic growth will reduce the budget deficits by two-thirds. And even if the remaining third isn't eliminated by higher taxes or reduced government spending, the recovery will not be materially impaired, he added.

The Harris economist is more optimistic about the longer-term growth potential of the economy than three of the leading national economic forecasting firms.

Davis forecasts that real economic growth will average 4.8 percent annually over the next five years. By contrast, the consensus forecast by Wharton Econometric Forecasting Associates, Data Resources and Chase Econometrics is for real growth to average 3.5 percent over the five-year period.

Davis asserts that the forecasting firms place undue emphasis on budget deficit forecasts. In addition, the forecasters have failed to realize the extent of the expansionary monetary forces that are impinging on the economy, he adds.

OPPOSES ANY NEW TAXES

Davis opposes the imposition of new taxes to help reduce the deficit, including any additional taxes on oil or gasoline.

"It would have a negative impact on the economy," he said. "The deficit isn't an indi-

cation of not collecting enough taxes, but of overspending by government."

On balance, it is monetary policy that most concerns Davis.

Noting that the Federal Reserve Board has been permitting the money supply to grow at an annual rate of about 13 percent since last August, Davis said he would have expected the central bank to slow down the money growth rate within the next 30 days.

"But retail sales are still weak, and the Fed may maintain its expansionary stance longer, perhaps up to another 60 days," the economist added.

"When the Fed does slow down the money supply growth, which could be in late April or early May, interest rates will be pushed higher. I would estimate that short-term rates will be up about 2 points in the second quarter from the low point in the first quarter of the year."

MARKET MAY PULL BACK

Davis characterized the projected interest move as an "upward blip" in the declining trend. He doesn't expect that to impede the recovery, but said it could trigger the pull-back in the stock market which so many analysts have been anticipating.

"Investors should be increasing their cash positions instead of buying stocks at this time," Davis suggested. "As to the magnitude of the market pullback, I'd be very surprised if the Dow Jones industrial average got below 1,050."

Davis said he expects the Fed to maintain a money growth rate that should keep inflation between 4.5 percent and 6 percent for the remainder of the decade.

At the same time, he warned that if the Fed should continue its expansive policy through most of the year, "we're going to find ourselves in a serious situation with inflation and interest rates rising again."

"If that happens, I can see inflation rising to double-digit levels again by the end of 1984," he concluded.

TRIBUTE TO FRANK E. PINDER II

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker. A truly great American, Frank E. Pinder II, is being honored today by one of the great universities in Florida's Second Congressional District—Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University.

Since earning his bachelor of science from Florida A&M in 1933, Frank Pinder has made great contributions to his nation and to its standing in the world—particularly in Africa where he has represented the United States and the United Nations in a variety of assignments.

Since beginning life in Key West, Fla., Frank Pinder has made it his life's work to share the knowledge he gained at Florida A&M, Tuskegee Institute, and as a Department of State fellow at Cornell University with the underdeveloped and developing nations in Africa.

His work has been so effective that Liberian President William V. S.

Tubman cited him for his personal contributions to that country during a 13-year assignment there and credited Frank Pinder with raising the standard of living for Liberian citizens.

During more than 40 years of foreign assignments, Frank Pinder has amassed one of the Nation's largest and most comprehensive collections of African arts and artifacts.

As a typical act of selflessness, Frank Pinder donated his collection to his alma mater last year where it is available for the enjoyment and education of all who wish to see it at the Florida Black Archives, Research Center and Museum at FAMU.

During his distinguished career, Frank Pinder has been honored by many, including the State Department which twice awarded him its Meritorious Service Award. He has also received honorary LLD degrees from Monrovia College in Liberia and Morris Brown College in Atlanta, and the Mary McLeod Bethune Medallion, the Florida A&M Outstanding Alumnus Award, and election to the FAMU Hall of Fame.

His service to mankind is being recognized again today by the Governor and cabinet of Florida at FAMU's annual Founders' Day celebration where he has been chosen to deliver the major address of the event.

I would like at this time to offer my own congratulations to Frank Pinder for his decades of contribution not only to his university, his State, and his nation, but to the entire world. ●

JUSTICE FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY CLAIMANTS

HON. FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of myself, Mr. VENTO, and Mr. JEFFORDS, I am introducing legislation today aimed at insuring that disability claimants receive a fair and honest hearing on their disability claims.

The bill will prevent the Department of Health and Human Services and the Social Security Administration from collecting individual data on administrative law judges on the number of disability claims they allow or deny and thus prevent the administration from tampering with the legitimate claims of the unfortunate individuals seeking to maintain their disability benefits.

Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry state that we need this legislation. The law is already very clear. Administrative law judges by law are not to be rated or judged on their performance (5 CFR 730.211 (1982)). However the administrative law judges in the Department of Health and Human Services have

charged that the administration has illegally developed a performance rating system which requires that they decide no more than two-thirds of the disability cases against the Government. This outrageous travesty of justice cannot be allowed to continue. The consequences of justice by quota systems undermines the very basis of our legal system.

By way of background I would like to remind my colleagues that the Congress enacted the Administrative Procedure Act (APA) of 1946 for the purpose of establishing a comprehensive scheme to insure fair and impartial administrative adjudications of disability claims. By this act, the ALJ's are freed from being "mere tools" of the agency they serve and are to be removable only for good cause as determined by the Merit System Protection Board. In short the APA created a comprehensive bulwark to protect ALJ's from agency pressure or interference in the performance of holding fair and impartial hearings and exercising their independent judgment in each case before them.

Claimants for disability benefits under the Social Security Act initially seek them through a State disability determination service. If their claims for benefits are denied by State disability determination services, claimants have a right to request a hearing before an ALJ. ALJ's assigned by HHS to hear disability claims are charged with the responsibility for holding those hearings and for making well-reasoned findings of fact and issuing written decisions based solely on the merits of the claim.

No real problems arose until the Department of Health and Human Services in 1980 developed an elaborate data-gathering system that collects information regarding each ALJ's work activity. Under this system the way each hearing is decided, in favor of or against the claimant, is recorded. Using these figures HHS has begun to single out ALJ's with high allowance rates—that is, those deciding 66% percent or more of cases in favor of the claimant—and has made them subject to being "counseled" and threatened with dismissal. It has actually dismissed three judges. Threatening ALJ's with removal or otherwise penalizing them for attempting to make honest and fair judgments based on the merits of each claimant is so contrary to our traditional ideas of justice that I am at a loss for words to describe the anger and outrage I feel. Creating an incentive for ALJ's to deny benefits to legitimate disability claimants irrespective of the merits of their claims, simply can not be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, the need to control social spending may require limits to compassion; it does not grant a license

for meanness. I urge my colleagues to join me in overturning a practice which strikes at the very heart of our ideal that justice must be fair and impartial.

H.R. 2188

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 221 of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(j)(1) In recognition of the unusual difficulty of the issues which are involved in the making and reviewing of disability determinations under this title and title XVI, the Secretary shall at all times exert a special effort to assure that administrative law judges who are engaged in reviewing such determinations are permitted to perform their functions and render their decisions in a fair and impartial manner, with an unrestricted opportunity to exercise their independent judgment and without interference from any officer, employee, or other entity of the Department of Health and Human Services, in compliance with all of the provisions of title 5 of the United States Code relating to administrative law judges and with the regulations issued thereunder.

"(2) In carrying out paragraph (1), the Secretary shall take such steps as may be necessary to guarantee that no administrative law judge engaged in reviewing disability determinations under this title or title XVI will ever be rated, ranked, or evaluated or have his performance judged (as a result of a review provided for by section 304(g) of the Social Security Disability Amendments of 1980 or otherwise) on the basis of the number or percentage of cases which he decides in favor of or against the claimant, or on any other basis which directly or indirectly takes into account the number or percentage of cases which he decides in favor of or against the claimant.

"(3) Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the Secretary from collecting, evaluating, and analyzing data with respect to the number or percentage of cases decided by administrative law judges in favor of and against claimants, so long as such data involves only the aggregate number or percentage of such cases and does not include specific information with respect to the number or percentage of cases decided in favor of or against the claimant by any particular administrative law judge."

SEC. 2. Section 1631(c) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"(4) The provisions of section 221(j) shall apply with respect to administrative law judges engaged in reviewing disability determinations under this title in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply with respect to administrative law judges engaged in reviewing such determinations under title II." ●

EL SALVADOR

HON. MARY ROSE OAKAR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Ms. OAKAR. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we were informed that a judge in El Salvador had derailed the trial of

the national guardsmen who are accused of murdering four American churchwomen in December 1980. In reducing the status of the case to a preliminary stage and delaying it indefinitely, El Salvador has, in effect, thumbed its nose once again at the United States and made a mockery of the certification process we acquiesced to in January. The accused guardsmen have been in custody since April of 1981. We are now on the verge of April 1983. Two of the guardsmen involved in the murders have confessed. Positive polygraph evidence exists. Other witnesses and fellow prisoners have testified to their guilt. Higher officers have been implicated—none seriously investigated.

When the representatives of the murdered women's families and their lawyers visited El Salvador earlier this year, they reported to the administration, the State Department, and the Congress on the incompetence, corruption, and intimidation that characterized the justice system in El Salvador. They testified in the House and Senate Chambers about the failure of the prosecutor to develop his case, the disappearance of important evidence such as X-rays, the admissions that higher officers could have been involved but are beyond investigation. For over 2 years, my office, among others has pressed the FBI, the Embassy, and other agencies to make the evidence they have gathered available to the families and their lawyers. Now, 27 months later, we are told that the prosecutor in El Salvador has not even seen this evidence.

Eight American citizens have been brutally murdered and mutilated by the security forces of El Salvador, not to mention some 35,000 Salvadorans. In over 2 years there has not been one conviction for the murders of any of these American or Salvadoran citizens. Yet we propose to send these same security forces more guns and equipment. Worse yet, the administration proposes to train them to be more efficient. Do we really believe that a few sermons at Fort Bragg will change the militarized culture of violence in El Salvador?

We have now sent over half a billion dollars to El Salvador in military and economic assistance since 1979, which is the lion's share of what we send to the whole of Latin America. What has been the result? More killing, more violence. More motivation and successes for the insurgents. More defeats for the Government. More anti-Americanism. More money is leaving El Salvador in capital flight than we are putting in.

When the history of the 20th century is written this will surely be ranked as one of the most morally indefensible acts of government.

In 1980 few Americans knew anything about El Salvador. Today most

Americans know more about El Salvador than about many regions of the United States. They know above all, that American blood has already been spilled there, and that American tax dollars have been wasted there. They have a right to be heard.

In January I introduced a resolution (H.J. Res. 89) to terminate military aid to El Salvador until Congress certifies that the appropriate conditions have been met. I urge you to join me in supporting that resolution and reclaim our responsibility as representatives of the American people. ●

TRIBUTE TO THE LEHMAN FAMILY

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Lehman family tradition of togetherness—both in business and in play—is continuing in the activity of jogging.

Matt, Andy, and David, Congressman BILL LEHMAN's grandsons, and the sons of Kathy Lehman Weiner, whose death in 1979 at age 39 was a family tragedy and a loss to the community, now join their father in the sport.

In this way, BILL's son-in-law Don has pulled his single parent family together and, as the following news article demonstrates, has done his best to make a real family for his boys.

[From the Miami Herald, Mar. 10, 1983]

FAMILY STAYS CLOSE BY LONG-DISTANCE—JOGGING, THAT IS

(By Gary Ferman)

Deep down inside, Don Weiner knows his three sons probably wouldn't be runners if he hadn't pushed them into it. But push he did, and 15-year-old David, 13-year-old Andy and 10-year-old Matt haven't exactly put up a fight.

Running has become a family affair for the Weiners, whether it be jogging around Granada Golf Course across the street from the Weiner household or participating in local 10K and middle distance runs.

But this is more than just a story of another parent who thrives on the sporting accomplishments of his offspring. Weiner, a 41-year-old math teacher at Miami High School, has been running for 13 years. Inspiring his three sons to join him, he figured, would be a good chance to spend more time with his kids.

"My gut feeling is that if I didn't ask them to participate, they wouldn't," said Weiner. "But parts of it they like and if they aren't hooked on it now, maybe they will be in the future."

Weiner is an experienced single parent. His wife died almost four years ago from a brain tumor.

Because of the age differences of the boys, Weiner said it is hard to find a common activity they all can enjoy. Even deciding on a movie is a major chore. So they run.

The kids participate in other athletic activities as well. David plays tennis for Coral

Gables High. Andy plays youth league tennis at the Biltmore tennis center and Matt is a soccer player at the Gables Youth Center.

But last Saturday morning, the family was together for the Calle Ocho 8K (five-mile) run. David was the family champion, finishing in 31 minutes. Father Don followed in 39 minutes. Andy and Matt crossed the finish line in 43 minutes.

They have run six races together so far this year, including the Jungle Jog five weeks ago at Metrozoo. After that race, the family took advantage of free zoo admission and spent the afternoon looking at animals.

But while Dad ran in the Orange Bowl Marathon—he quit after 14 miles because of a problem with a graphite inner sole he wears for knee and lower back problems—the boys remained on the sidelines.

"The marathon is just too long for them," said Weiner. "It would take too much work."

David, despite being the quickest in the family, finds running to be the most labor. Matt, the youngest who would prefer to spend his mornings, afternoons and evenings watching television, finds it the most boring.

"But they all like the refreshments and free T-shirts at the finish line," said Weiner. "And Matt likes hanging his running numbers all over the walls of his bedroom. The running aspect is what is hard for them. But I think it's a worthwhile thing. It's a way we can have a lot of fun together."

NEW YORK STATE RESOLUTION

HON. WILLIAM CARNEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Speaker, as the debate continues over the proper approach to take in our effort to reduce the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union, I think it is very significant that the senate of the State of New York has passed a resolution expressing the support of that body for the two arms reductions negotiations now underway in Geneva, Switzerland.

The New York Senate resolution closely parallels the approach advocated by House Joint Resolution 4, the Broomfield, Stratton, Carney, Price alternative to the well-meaning but misguided House Joint Resolution 13.

I would like to submit the New York State Senate resolution for inclusion in the RECORD of the nuclear arms control debate in the House.

STATE OF NEW YORK—THE LEGISLATURE,
ALBANY

LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION, SENATE NO. 240

In Senate—By: Senators Marchi, Nolan and Smith.

Legislative resolution calling for mutual and verifiable reductions in nuclear arsenals and expressing the full support of the Legislature of the State of New York for the two ongoing arms reduction negotiations in Geneva between the United States of America and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Whereas, One of the greatest continuing challenges facing mankind is to prevent the outbreak of nuclear war; and

Whereas, There is increasing concern worldwide over the risk of nuclear war; and

Whereas, On the initiative of the United States of America, two important sets of negotiations on strategic and intermediate-range nuclear weapons are well underway in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union and these negotiations have the full support of the nations of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization; and

Whereas, In these negotiations the United States has advanced serious and detailed proposals for sweeping reductions in strategic and intermediate nuclear arms focusing on the most destabilizing weapons of both powers; and

Whereas, United States negotiators at these negotiations have reported that the negotiations are moving in the direction of substantial reductions and that the Soviet delegations are negotiating seriously on these issues: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York:

(1) Strongly supports these ongoing negotiations directed toward substantial reductions in the nuclear arsenals of the United States and the Soviet Union, the success of which would materially reduce the danger of nuclear war;

(2) Urges both negotiating powers to work toward the achievement of equitable and verifiable agreements which freeze strategic nuclear forces at equal and substantially reduced levels, thereby further reducing the possibility of nuclear war;

(3) Urges both powers to negotiate effective verification of the terms of the agreements achieved;

(4) Urges both powers to negotiate to the maximum extent feasible confidence building measures such as those proposed by the United States which are likely to reduce the risk of nuclear war by reason of error or misunderstanding; and

(5) Urges both powers to concentrate special attention on reducing those weapons which because of their destructiveness and speed are judged to be especially destabilizing; and be it further

Resolved, That the Legislature of the State of New York requests all residents of this and other states and all peace-loving peoples worldwide to unite in supporting the objectives of the ongoing negotiations in Geneva between the United States and the Soviet Union, and refrain from actions that could denigrate or impair their success, recognizing that their success will move the world closer toward the kind of lasting peace which all of us devoutly seek.

Adopted in Senate on March 9, 1983.

By order of the Senate,

STEPHEN F. SLOAN,
Secretary.●

AMNESTY INTERNATIONAL'S
HUDSON VALLEY GROUP
CALLS FOR RELEASE OF RIKHARD SPALIN

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring to the attention of my colleagues the plight of Mr. Rikhard

Spalin of the Soviet Union, who has been adopted by Amnesty International as a "Prisoner of Conscience." Mr. Spalin's case has been monitored for the past 2 years by Amnesty International's Hudson Valley Group of Tarrytown, N.Y.

Mr. Spalin is a member of the Church of the True and Free Seventh Day Adventists, a religious group that has resisted the Soviet Government's efforts to restrict and control their religious activities. According to Amnesty International, Mr. Spalin was arrested in June 1979 and charged with circulating antigovernment slander, engaging in a prohibited trade, and stealing state property. Mr. Spalin was reportedly arrested for salvaging a discarded printing press and using it to print True Witness, an underground religious newspaper. It appears that he has been imprisoned solely for exercising his religion and expressing his beliefs, in violation of the U.N. Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (articles 18 and 19), ratified by the Soviet Union in 1973.

I strongly urge the Reagan administration, and the State Department Bureau of Human Rights and Humanitarian Affairs in particular, to speak out against this denial of freedom of religion and freedom of expression, to monitor the condition of Rikhard Spalin and request that he be released, and to urge the Soviet Union to abide by internationally accepted standards of human rights. I would also like to thank the Hudson Valley Group for bringing Mr. Spalin's case to my attention. As I have said of all the Amnesty International chapters in Westchester that I have worked with, these people have been vigilant in their defense of human rights throughout the world. Their compassion for their fellow human beings is an example to us all, and they deserve the highest praise for their work.●

1982-83 VFW VOICE OF DEMOCRACY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM
TENNESSEE WINNER

HON. ED JONES

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. JONES of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to insert in the RECORD the speech of Miss Tammy Veazey of Cottage Grove, Tenn. Miss Veazey resides in my district and attends Henry County High School. The remarks which I am sharing with my colleagues today represent the winning speech in the Tennessee 1983 Voice of Democracy contest sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Miss Veazey's speech eloquently demonstrates the continuing enthusi-

asm and hopes of the young people of this country. I want to personally congratulate her for her winning speech and share with my colleagues its contents.

It is early in the morning. The children file sleepily through the door and take their places beside their desks. But before the day's activities begin, tiny hands are placed over sincere little hearts and a room full of shining eyes turn upward, and come to rest on "Old Glory." "I Pledge Allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America," begins each childish voice, and here, in this typical third grade classroom, the spirit and strength of America are flowing strong.

Yes, it is here in this classroom, in other classrooms like it, and anywhere else that young people can be found, that the true strength of America lies.

A part of this strength lies in the idealism so often associated with youth. Our country has always had high hopes. From the first man to set foot on Plymouth Rock to the first man to set foot on the moon, Americans have set high, idealistic goals, and we have reached them. Who better to carry on this tradition than the most idealistic people in the world—young people.

Another important quality of youth is resiliency. After the protests of the sixties and the Watergate scandal of the seventies, young people naturally felt disillusioned and confused. But the confusion is gone, and we have learned many valuable lessons. We now know that the government is not perfect, but we've also learned that nothing is accomplished by withdrawing from society. We must work within the system to improve things. So here we are—a generation of enduring spirits—back in the ring, rolling with the punches, and fighting for what we believe in.

It is also because of youth that we have kept alive in our nation two very important virtues which go hand in hand—daring and creativity. We have the pride to want to keep tradition alive, but the boldness to eliminate the outdated. We also possess the creativity to replace these old ideas with fresh, modern ones. For instance *** remember those third graders saying the Pledge of Allegiance to our Flag? Well, when the Pledge is over, the class might very well turn around and begin working their lessons—on a computer—developing patterns of thought and logic which will be used to solve problems that you and I have not even dreamed of.

It is for these reasons and many others that younger generations demand and deserve the faith and trust of their fellow countrymen. We can make all the difference, because the true quality of a nation depends, not upon the amount of land she encompasses, or the number of atomic bombs she possesses but upon the quality of her citizens and leaders. These patriots of tomorrow will be found among the youth of today. Yes, as long as America continues giving it's youth room to grow, the hope and potential of our country is as vast and limitless as the heavens.

What will the future hold? It is impossible to tell, because the future is as far away as the most distant star, but as close to us all as a third grade child.●

THE NATURAL GAS EQUAL ACCESS AMENDMENTS OF 1983

HON. PATRICIA SCHROEDER

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced the Natural Gas Equal Access Amendments of 1983. The bill would have the effect of lowering natural gas prices by allowing purchasers to shop around for the cheapest natural gas. Currently, gas prices are higher than need be because pipelines are simply not buying and transporting the cheapest gas. Local distribution companies buy most of their gas from a pipeline who in turn buys it from a pipeline production affiliate or some other natural gas producer. This bill would allow direct purchases from producers and would make available cheap natural gas that is currently not reaching the market.

SECTION-BY-SECTION DESCRIPTION OF THE "NATURAL GAS EQUAL ACCESS AMENDMENTS OF 1983"

Sec. 1. Title—"Natural Gas Equal Access Amendments of 1983".

Sec. 2. Findings and Purpose.

Findings: A national market for natural gas does not now exist, causing severe economic dislocations and impeding prudent gas development with end-user prices varying widely. The lack of a national market is detrimental to both consumers and producers and exists due to the basic structure of the natural gas industry as required by federal laws and regulations. The monopoly powers of natural gas pipelines over producers and consumers prevent development of a critically necessary national market for natural gas.

Purpose: The purpose of the bill is to establish a national market for gas by encouraging direct sales of gas between producers and end-users of their wholesalers and requiring transportation of gas involved in direct sales.

Sec. 3. Equal Access to Natural Gas Transportation Facilities.

(a) Transporters shall transport gas based on available capacity upon demonstration of need.

(b) Any gas not currently under contract is available for transportation. Sec. 8 establishes mechanisms for freeing certain categories of gas from existing contracts.

(c) Tariffs would be established for transportation, such tariffs to be cost-based and just and reasonable as determined by the FERC.

(d) Establishes rules for submission of requests for transportation.

(e) Specifies how the need for transportation is documented and establishes minimum tender requirements of 500 Mcf per day for a minimum of 180 days. These minimum requirements are excused for gas for which the contract has been marketed-out or breached by the purchaser. FERC is allowed to modify these requirements in the public interest.

(f) Establishes that capacity is available for gas to be transported under this bill unless the Commission finds upon hearing that sufficient capacity does not exist. In the event partial capacity exists, transportation will be mandatory to that extent. Stor-

age capacity and current documented demands for gas supply will be considered in determining available capacity. The Commission will require compression and may require looping to increase capacity, with costs being allocated equitably to protect existing users. Ratable transportation is required where insufficient capacity exists to transport gas involved in all applications. High priority users will continue to be protected. Precludes affiliates of pipelines, interstate or intrastate, from selling equal access gas, retaining that gas as general system supplies. Presidential emergency allocation is maintained.

Sec. 4. Definition of Natural Gas Transporter.

Defines transporter as interstate and intrastate pipelines and local distribution companies—excludes gathering systems.

Sec. 5. Natural Gas Transporters Having No Available Capacity.

Restricts new purchases and sales by transporters determined to have no available capacity.

Sec. 6. Reduction of Minimum Bills and Service Obligations.

Provides for reduction of service obligations of pipelines to customers and minimum bill obligations of such customers to pipelines to the extent that gas transported under this bill is purchased.

Sec. 7. Amendment of Service Classification.

Prevents change of service classification without Commission hearing where user is buying both pipeline supplies and equal access gas.

Sec. 8. Increased Availability of Gas.

In addition to uncontracted gas, certain other gas is made available for direct sale and transportation. These categories are newly drilled gas currently under contract, gas which reached contract renegotiation points or the end of its primary contract term, and heavily curtailed gas. Marketed-out gas or gas under contracts breached for any reason are uncontracted and also eligible. Provides that new contracts may waive equal access treatment otherwise applicable to newly drilled gas or gas at renegotiation point.

Sec. 9. Nonapplicability of Natural Gas Act to Certain Sales by Exempt Pipelines.

Preserves Hinshaw exemption.

Sec. 10. Limitations on Charges Payable by Affiliated Entities.

Modifies the pricing provisions of the NGPA to provide that prices paid by pipelines to their production affiliates cannot exceed the lowest paid in comparable sales to unaffiliated producers, as opposed to the highest price as now allowed.

Sec. 11. Effective Dates.

Upon enactment.●

RECOGNITION OF INDUSTRY/ EDUCATION WEEK IN OHIO

HON. JOHN R. KASICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. KASICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize and honor the activities of many Ohio citizens who have given their time, energy, and abilities to promoting greater cooperation and awareness between industry and education. Our

country, and particularly the State of Ohio, is entering a renaissance of high technology which requires a highly educated and skilled work force. To meet the challenges of this emerging economy, every effort must be made to develop a renewed and sustained spirit of collaboration by government, industry, and education. For the benefit of our youth and young adults, all levels of government should provide incentives and encouragement to efforts that help prepare our young people to meet the challenges of tomorrow. Therefore, I would like to proclaim my recognition of the week of March 14 through March 20, 1983, as Industry/Education Week in Ohio.

In addition, I would like to submit the following statement:

RECOGNITION OF OHIO INDUSTRY/EDUCATION WEEK

Whereas, there is an ever increasing need to improve the level of awareness of industry's role in the education of Ohio's youth and young adults; and

Whereas, industry, education and government have developed a number of diverse programs to provide a more relevant scope of education; and

Whereas, the world's one time resources are being exhausted and industry, education and government must work together to develop new technology to help provide for the survival of the human race; and

Whereas, the need exists to promote and encourage greater effort than ever before to insure that education, industry and government cooperate to insure that the education and research of the future necessary for survival become a reality:

Now, therefore, I give my support and recognition to the week of March 14 through March 20, 1983 as Industry/Education Week in Ohio, to honor and to thank the dedicated citizens of Ohio who have given freely of their time, energy and abilities. I call upon all citizens of Ohio to help renew and sustain the spirit of cooperation and collaboration which have made this nation great by encouraging even greater efforts in industry/education to recognize and provide for the needs of the future.●

BILL TO GRANT PUBLIC CHARITY STATUS TO CERTAIN MUSEUMS AND LIBRARIES

HON. JAMES M. SHANNON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. SHANNON. Mr. Speaker, Congressmen BARBER CONABLE, RICHARD GEPHARDT, and I are introducing a bill to limit the unnecessary and unfortunate application of the private foundation rules to certain museums and libraries. The museums and libraries to which this bill is directed are typically small institutions with specialized collections that rely for their financial support on a limited universe of donors.

Under present law, certain institutions such as religious organizations, educational institutions, and hospitals

are automatically classified as public charities. Institutions such as museums and libraries, however, must satisfy certain standards of public support in order to be classified as public charities. In general, the public support test is satisfied if the institution receives at least one-third of its total support from public sources or if the institution satisfies a facts-and-circumstances test as described in the IRS regulations in which at least 10 percent of its financial support comes from governmental or other public sources and it maintains an active program to solicit funds from the general public.

Each charitable organization which fails to satisfy the public support or facts and circumstances test is classified as a private foundation and is subject to a set of requirements not imposed on public charities. These requirements include limitations on gifts, additional recordkeeping for donors as well as recipients, a 2-percent excise tax, and a variety of practical limits on the operation of the institution.

Unfortunately, the mechanics of the public support test are causing, or threaten to cause, certain museums and libraries to be classified as private foundations even though they receive their contributions from public sources and their public solicitation efforts are unchanged. For example, organizations that have had the good fortune to be the beneficiaries of successful endowments may be classified as private foundations because they are beneficiaries of a trust that produces such substantial income that it reduces their amount of relative public support. To avoid private foundation status, these museums and libraries will be forced to seek additional public support to maintain their 10-percent ratio, which will reduce the amount of charitable donations available to other worthy—and less financially secure—institutions. Thus, maldistribution of donations is encouraged at a time when the available amount of contributions is shrinking. Furthermore, these institutions must often incur significant legal and accounting fees in their efforts to comply with the public support guidelines; amounts that would otherwise go to the tax-exempt purpose of the institutions are thereby diverted to this purpose.

The bill that we are introducing today provides that museums and libraries which satisfy strict standards designed to assure public involvement and accountability be excluded from the private foundation rule just as churches, schools, and hospitals are excluded under current law. In the case of a museum, at least 25 percent of the governing body of the institution would have to consist of community leaders or local public officials, and the museum would, as its princi-

pal function, have to employ a professional staff for the exhibition of tangible objects to the general public on a regular and continuous basis at little or no charge. A library must have been established by a law of the United States, a State, a possession, or the District of Columbia, or have been established before 1789; and must be operated by an organization as a permanent and principal part of its public services. In addition, the library must be open and available to the general public at no charge and be operated by an organization none of whose income is expended for purposes other than the construction, maintenance, expansion, operation, or management of the library. These standards are substantially similar to those for excluding schools and hospitals from the private foundation rules.

We wish to emphasize that our bill is not intended to eliminate the distinction between public charities and private foundations. We support reasonable safeguards against potential abuses of tax-exempt status for personal and private benefit. Our bill, however, is designed to assure that the distinction affects only those organizations for which it was originally intended. A museum or library that is committed to providing access to the public at little or no charge should be classified as a public charity.●

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently, the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration held hearings to consider a resolution that would authorize a bust of the late Senator Carl Hayden, of Arizona, to be placed in the Capitol. Companion legislation has been introduced in the House which I am proud to cosponsor.

Senator Hayden set records for senatorial and congressional longevity by serving for 57 years on Capitol Hill. In 1912, then-Representative Hayden, came to Washington as the first Representative from the newly admitted State of Arizona. Carl Hayden spent 15 years in the House before being elected to the first of seven Senate terms. During his tenure in the Senate, Hayden rose to chair the Senate Appropriations Committee. He held that position for 14 years.

Carl Hayden was a workhorse in the Congress and a man of honesty and integrity. At the March 3 Rules Committee hearing, Mr. Roy Elson, Senator Hayden's administrative assistant, spoke in favor of establishing a memorial to Carl Hayden. Mr. Elson's re-

marks aptly describe the contributions Carl Hayden made to the legislative process, and the character of the man. I would like to share these remarks with my colleagues.

STATEMENT OF ROY ELSON REGARDING A
TRIBUTE TO SENATOR CARL HAYDEN

Mr. Chairman, I feel particularly honored to be here today, as I am, of course, a non-Member. Once I came very close, and once, as Senator Goldwater will remember, not so close. On both occasions, I was greatly assisted by Senator DeConcini and his family. But to paraphrase Lincoln, "... I am too old to cry and it still hurts too much to laugh."

A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away, an infant was born—the first white child born in Hayden's Ferry, in the Territory of Arizona. Now, five score and six years later, we are here to honor him. It is most gratifying to know that this gesture is being considered for the late Carl Hayden. One caveat, however: any comment from me is bound to be prejudiced. I cannot be objective on this issue anymore than any Member of this Committee could in speaking about someone you loved; and, of course, so much of my life has been intertwined with that of Carl Hayden. He was my teacher, my example and my friend. Whatever good I may have from time to time been able to do or whatever virtue I may possess, I owe largely to him. As for my failures and faults they have all been self-achieved.

This great, gentle man—who, it seems, so recently left us—came here, let us be reminded, when William H. Taft was President, before anyone ever dreamed of the Somme, or Verdun, or the self-starter or the crystal set; before woman's suffrage, collective bargaining, social security, and the income tax; before Prohibition, Repeal, penicillin, the pill or Pearl Harbor; before anyone ever heard of Lenin, Lindbergh, the Anschluss, Anzio, or Alamogordo; it was even before there were Administrative Assistants.

When Carl Hayden entered the Congress, millions were alive who had been slaves and Civil War veterans were the most powerful bloc in America, yet he would live to fight for civil rights in that same Congress.

When he entered the Congress, the Titanic had not yet sunk, John Fitzgerald Kennedy, who would now be sixty-six years old, had not yet been born, Nicholas II was Tsar, and Britain ruled almost three-quarters of the surface of the earth, and in America the mule and the horse were king; yet he lived to see hearts transplanted and men walk on the moon.

Chronologically, he was an Edwardian; in principle, he was a libertarian; in all ways, he was an American.

There is neither time or space for me to list and then review his accomplishments and contributions. They were monumental. Just let me say that Carl Hayden was a masterful carpenter. He knew how and when to lay the foundations on which so much could be built. He supported and helped enact every major piece of legislation which made capital improvements in the wealth of this Nation: in navigation, in aviation, in highways, in railroads, in mining, in reclamation, in public lands, in parks and recreation. He supported the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the New Frontier and the Great Society. He sponsored the amendment giving women the right to vote and joined early on in the struggle for the civil rights of all Americans.

He believed in people—especially young people. He thought that one of the greatest legislative enactments during his tenure in the Congress, and one he helped to pass, was the World War II "G.I." bill.

As a politician, the record speaks for itself—67 consecutive years in elective offices. The only election he lost was for student president of Stanford and that was before the turn of the century.

His personal qualities were those we would all like to have. He was fearless and totally honest. He found some good in all men. He was kind and considerate and always respectful of others. If he ever gave you his word it could not be broken. Kipling's poem, "If," probably comes closest to describing his character.

Of this we may be certain: He would have opposed any memorial of himself, not out of any false modesty, but because of an oft-expressed belief that only those men and women who have been dead for at least half-a-century should be so honored, that their stature be triangulated from the perspective of time. Senator Hayden would say, "Why not honor Tom Payne, the man who may have invented the United States and who remains totally unhonored in this the country he helped create?" In this respect, my heart concurs and yet I find myself disloyal to his beliefs for the first time in advocating this memorial.

Candor compels me to disclose that my motives are threefold: First, admiration; second, what I hope is a pardonable affection; and, third, the observation that we have, as a Nation, sometimes remembered in a momentary passion those who seem somewhat less worthy.

Senator Hayden has been absent from these halls he so loved for a decade and a half now. Those who were born at the time of his retirement will soon be old enough to vote. In view of the passage of time in this mercurial world, the approval of a bust for the man who served in the Congress for 57 consecutive years—a record that most assuredly will stand for all time—could hardly be characterized as precipitous, or even to the most conservative regarding memorials, as "... a disintegrating erosion of particular exceptions."

I heard Senator Hayden say many times that "gratitude is a lively appreciation of things yet to come." I am pleased beyond measure that the Congress, on behalf of the Republic it represents, may perhaps demonstrate its gratitude to him, its most venerable Member, and, thereby, for once prove the Old Man wrong. ●

SITUATION IN EL SALVADOR

HON. DOUGLAS K. BEREUTER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to this editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of March 16. I believe that this gives an accurate representation of the situation in El Salvador and I commend the Post's editorial writers for their insights into this area.

[From the Washington Post, Wednesday, Mar. 16, 1983]

MORE AID FOR EL SALVADOR?

More aid for El Salvador, as the Reagan administration requests? Of course. It is an \$80-million-a-year war—that's the amount sent last year and sought next year. This year, the foreign aid bill collapsed, leaving El Salvador short \$60 million. Not to pony it up would probably finish off the government. Is that what the Congress wants, or is ready to take the responsibility for?

The trouble is that the administration and its critics are drawing divergent conclusions from the condition that has launched this latest argument, the sagging of the Salvadoran war effort. The administration would bull through its program of financing the war (while sending more advisers), trying to edge forward reforms and human rights, and cosponsoring the local government's plan to draw the opposition into its electoral scheme. The doubters fear the bottom is dropping out. They urge an effort to save the American investment by promoting negotiations, talks, "dialogue."

They are right. The administration equates talks with letting the guerrillas "shoot their way into power." But a little perspective is in order. The generals who are now on top shot their way in. Granted, at American prodding they have devolved uncertain power on a body elected since. If full power had actually been taken by that body elected a year ago, the administration would have had fits, since a feudal party won. The point of government-guerrilla talks, their State Department advocates say, is not to distribute power arbitrarily but to shape democratic political processes. It's certainly risky. Increasingly, it looks like the only alternative.

Secretary of State George Shultz's attitude is puzzling. He was questioned in the Senate on the calls for dialogue emanating from Salvador's acting archbishop and from Pope John Paul II, whose visit to Salvador next Sunday is eagerly anticipated by partisans of reconciliation. Mr. Shultz replied with a reference to "churchmen who want to see Soviet influence in El Salvador improved." Separately, he was asked if the United States would actively oppose government-guerrilla negotiations even if the Salvadoran government were interested. "I wouldn't think it would be a good idea," the secretary said.

President Reagan pledged, in his recent American Legion speech, "to explore all possibilities for reconciliation and peace in Central America." It is a tall order, and he has yet to deliver on it. ●

THE 73D ANNIVERSARY OF
CAMP FIRE GIRLS

HON. ALAN WHEAT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. WHEAT. Mr. Speaker, today marks the 73d anniversary of Camp Fire, founded in 1910 as Camp Fire Girls by Luther Halsey and Charlotte Vetter Gulick. Today's 500,000 Camp Fire members include both girls and boys from birth to age 21 in more than 35,000 communities across the United States.

The purpose of Camp Fire is to provide, through a program of informal education, opportunities for youth to realize their potential and to function effectively as caring, self-directed individuals responsible to themselves and others; and, as an organization, to seek to improve those conditions in society which affect youth. Membership in Camp Fire is open to everyone regardless of race, creed, religion, national origin, or sex.

In Camp Fire boys and girls learn self-development, social skills, and service to their communities. Camp Fire includes programs for small groups which meet on a regular basis, resident and day-camp programs, and special programs based on community assessments and designed to meet local community needs, such as day-care centers, youth employment programs, self-reliance courses, programs on nutrition, juvenile justice and sexual abuse of children, and programs for exceptional children, migrant children, and economically disadvantaged children.

In 1977 Camp Fire moved its headquarters from New York to Kansas City, Mo. Both Camp Fire and Kansas City have benefited from the move. Congratulations to Camp Fire as its members celebrate another milestone in their continuing efforts to improve the quality of life for young people and their communities.●

IN MEMORY OF ALLARD
LOWENSTEIN

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, this past Monday marked the third year since the tragic death of Allard Lowenstein. In his memory, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a statement he made in 1968 on the role the youth of our Nation play in correcting the injustices of the world.

The statement follows:

I know you've heard other views, but I think we are fortunate in the Western world that some of the evils in our culture inconsistent with our pretensions and ideals are being challenged at root by people with energy, vigor and determination to produce something better, even though they're not often equipped to know how to bring it about. It is healthy to see Americans denouncing what their government is doing abroad. One would hope to see a similar response by Indians about Kashmir, Nigerians about Biafra, and so on. Out of awareness that the world needs something more than a constant defense of each country by its leading intellectuals and political figures, we might begin to struggle to some really international solutions to world problems.

The closest thing that has arisen yet to genuine internationalism is what is coming

out of young people. We are extremely fortunate that the next generation is in revolt against hypocrisies encrusted in the affluent world and is committed to basic social change. If this revolution had been directed in favor of racism, war or privilege, we would be in dark straits. Instead of regarding it as a threat, we should welcome the energy unleashed through people who have almost everything materially and, precisely because of that, find it inadequate for human beings.

Of course, this revolution runs up against the unbending resistance to changes in the assumptions of a Western world which has long been conservative. As a result, you have sometimes drift and sometimes a lurch into anarchy, a revolt against any institution, anything that doesn't automatically change when asked to. You get into difficulties of communication and of assessing what is a valid demand and what is a demand simply to make demands. But if we would roll with this challenge, accept the validity of much of it and really examine our own presuppositions, we would, I think, quickly make significant contributions to the education of younger people. Too many of us don't do that; they simply reiterate their own previous assertions, and if the young don't accept them, the confrontation escalates.

There are two very different areas where liberalism and Western progress have been least effective. Thanks to technology and the development of capital in sufficient quantities to make money available for many things, we have now removed, for perhaps eighty percent of our people in this country and, in varying percentages, something like that in most of the developed world, the worst of the scourges of exterior injustice and misery. The worst of the failures of liberalism is that we've never been able to figure out how to extend that process of enlightenment and assistance to the remaining pockets of deprived people.

The other problem is that we've discovered that even after we've removed the exterior causes of unhappiness we don't produce a happy society at all. Unless we begin to figure out how we can make lives seem fuller, communication between people more easy, and give them a sense of participating in their own destiny, the revolution is going to say, "Even if you remove poverty and war, all you've done is leave us with a vacuous society." In places like Holland, where there's no war and very little racism, and young people still burst out in anarchic ways, that problem is even more important than war, poverty and racism.

If, here in the United States, we are really to face the deep scars we have, we must face the implications for our world policies. You can't spend seventy-two percent of your budget on military and foreign policy without money that needs to be spent elsewhere. The United States certainly can't enter into a period of total withdrawal from the world. But we must reeducate our people to what really safeguards this country from the dangers they fear. That is going to mean more funds spent on education, housing and so forth, which we've been neglecting in the past in deference to other concepts of the world.

When the United States sneezes, places far away get pneumonia. So we have an enormous obligation to reassess some of the hypocrisies our own young people are challenging. Dictatorship in Spain or dictatorship in Greece cannot be virtuous because it says it's anti-Communist if in fact what

we're opposed to is oppression by dictators. The assertion that we must do something in the Dominican Republic or Vietnam or Greece or Spain in the name of outmoded notions of what the world is about will produce great chasms between the generations. The people coming along free of that kind of stereotype reject it, particularly when it leads to their being sent off to die in wars which they can see are not connected to the idealism and democracy they've been raised to believe the country should stand for. If we want seriously to cope with the revolution of the next generation, we have to understand this interlocking of foreign and domestic questions, economically and in terms of the perception of what is hypocritical and what is honest. America must again become the symbol of justice and decency in the world that we were becoming under Presidents Kennedy and Roosevelt.

If there's a lesson America has given the world this past year, it is, I hope, that the energies of youth, properly channeled, can become dominant in changing countries with an opportunity for freedom into actually free countries. By welcoming young people in their efforts, we could create some form of international community that would be not only the generational one of the affluent young revolting in Paris, or Italy, or here, but of all people concerned about a world in which the processes of change could be encompassed without extermination and death. If we don't do that, I think, the world will fall apart. What could be a greater calamity and misreading of the necessities of life than to assume this is inevitable?●

IRISH WILDERNESS

HON. HAROLD L. VOLKMER

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. VOLKMER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing legislation designating the Irish wilderness area in southern Missouri as part of the national wilderness preservation system.

I am joined in this effort by two of my colleagues from Missouri, Mr. CLAY and Mr. WHEAT.

The area to be designated consists of roughly 17,000 acres in Oregon County. The land is owned by the Federal Government as part of the Mark Twain National Forest.

The natural beauty of the Irish wilderness is a treasure which far outweighs the commercial value of the land, and this small part of the Missouri Ozarks should be preserved for future generations to enjoy.

The area, which was settled by Irish immigrants in the 1850's, is widely recognized as one of the most beautiful wilderness areas in the State. Situated along the free-flowing Eleven Point River, the area contains hollows, ridges, and bluffs that are rich with history, wildlife, and natural beauty.

The Irish wilderness designation has been endorsed by nearly every major newspaper in Missouri and enjoys the support of a coalition of more than 40

environmental and landowners groups. On this St. Patrick's Day, I am also pleased to report that this bill has the strong support of the Ancient Order of Hibernians. ●

AMEND SECTION 513 OF THE TAX CODE

HON. FRANK J. GUARINI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. GUARINI. Mr. Speaker, recently my distinguished colleague from the State of Tennessee, Mr. DUNCAN, introduced H.R. 1773, a bill to exempt from taxation income earned by certain tax-exempt organizations through exchanging, renting, or selling the names and addresses from donor or membership lists. I was pleased to join Mr. DUNCAN as a cosponsor at the introduction of this legislation.

Under current law, income earned by an exempt organization from a trade or business which is regularly carried on and is not substantially related to the activities constituting the basis for the organization's tax exemption is considered to be unrelated business income subject to taxation. This provision, first enacted in 1950, was designed to prevent exempt groups from having an unfair competitive edge over taxable businesses engaged in similar activities.

Recently, the Court of Claims and the Internal Revenue Service have taken the position that income earned by groups from the rental or exchange of donor lists constitutes unrelated business income subject to taxation. H.R. 1773 addresses these rulings and adds to section 513 of the Internal Revenue Code a specific exemption from taxation for income earned through the exchange, sale, or rental of names and addresses from donor or memberships. It would apply to all section 501 organizations contributions to which are deductible under section 170 of the Tax Code.

Tax-exempt organizations provide a wide range of services and programs for needy individuals. Many of these services and programs assist particular groups of people who otherwise would go unaided. For example, through its national service program, the Disabled American Veterans offers free assistance to veterans in penetrating the bureaucratic maze and obtaining the benefits to which they are entitled.

Funds for the services and programs provided by tax-exempt groups come primarily from tax-deductible contributions. Contributions are solicited generally by direct mail from individuals whose names are maintained on donor or member lists. To keep the lists current, names of individuals who have died, moved or no longer contrib-

ute are removed. The name attrition rate can be high. In the case of the Disabled American Veterans, for example, the attrition rate runs about 12 percent per year.

To maintain donor lists large enough to provide organizations with the contributions required to sustain their programs, these names must be replaced. Replacement is best accomplished through the rental, sale, or exchange of names from an organization's donor list with other organizations. Not only does the acquisition of new names through these means help maintain a list large enough to sustain an organization's program in these difficult economic times, but also income from the rental, sale or exchange of lists helps defray the high costs of acquisition of names and maintenance of a donor list.

Since its enactment in 1950, section 513 of the code has been amended frequently to provide exceptions to the taxation of unrelated business income. Public entertainment activities at agricultural fairs, certain convention and trade show activities, billing and data processing services rendered for hospitals by hospital service organizations, bingo games, and certain telephone and electric pole rentals have been exempted. In enacting these exemptions, Congress found that the benefit to the exempt entity through relief from unrelated business tax outweighed any detriment to competing commercial enterprises.

Such is that case here. Exempt organizations that rent, sell, or exchange their own mailing lists do not directly compete with commercial mailing organizations. Each donor or membership list is unique. Exempt groups do not act as a clearinghouse for other interested parties and do not engage in direct mail activities for groups other than themselves. Thus, they do not compete with commercial groups that offer a full range of direct mail services.

We are now calling on the private sector to provide more than ever before to meet our national needs, ranging from education and the arts to health and the preservation of rights. The proposed amendment to section 513 will materially assist exempt organizations in their efforts to solicit needed funds from the public and at minimal loss of revenue.

It is my hope that Congress will act on this legislation quickly and favorably. ●

CORPORATE AMERICA REJECTS NERVE GAS BUSINESS

HON. MARGE ROUKEMA

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mrs. ROUKEMA. Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives will soon be faced with making a historic decision on the question of whether the United States should resume production of lethal chemical weapons. Last year, this House, by a 251-to-159 vote, reaffirmed our Nation's longstanding decision not to produce new chemical weapons and our commitment to abide by the Geneva Protocol of 1925 prohibiting the use of chemical weapons in warfare. Additionally, that decision reaffirmed our Nation's commitment to the Biological Weapons Convention of 1972.

Congressional concerns regarding the administration's proposal to begin production of lethal nerve gas are also shared, interestingly, by numerous American corporations, including those chemical companies who would stand to benefit economically from such a program. I believe that private industry's reluctance to become involved in this multibillion-dollar nerve gas program reflects the opposition of the American people to these weapons of indiscriminate and mass destruction.

In light of the ongoing debate on this important issue, I would like to share with my colleagues an article which appeared on May 17, 1982, in *Fortune* magazine entitled "The Military Contract the Big Firms Shun."

THE MILITARY CONTRACT THE BIG FIRMS SHUN

(By Lee Smith)

A military project in search of a congressional appropriation can often count on some cheerleaders among the civilian contractors likely to benefit. New tactical fighters and assault ships have rosters. Nerve gas, it turns out, does not.

In the Administration's military budget now before Congress is a request for money to resume the production of nerve gas, which the U.S. has not made since President Nixon stopped the manufacture of chemical weapons in 1969. The Administration wants \$46.7 million for new chemical weapons in fiscal 1983, the first year of a five-year rebuilding program. Based on the quantities the Army is calling for, subsequent annual expenditures should be considerably higher, though the Army won't say how much higher.

President Reagan says the U.S. must modernize its chemical arsenal to match the Russians' and ultimately persuade them that both sides should dispose of all such weapons. The State Department recently released a 32-page report maintaining that the Russians and their allies have actually used chemical and biological weapons in South-east Asia and Afghanistan.

LETHAL TO CONVERSATION

Whatever the merits of the Administration's case, it is not galvanizing industry. Most big chemical companies are decidedly not interested in making nerve gas. "You have to be a masochist to want to get into that business," says the lobbyist for one major company. So emphatic are some companies that they refuse even to discuss the subject. The very words "nerve gas" can be lethal to conversation, turning senior management mute and normally amiable public-relations spokesmen chilly.

Several months ago the Army ran an advertisement in the *Commerce Business Daily*, a publication read carefully by hundreds of companies eager to supply the government with goods and services ranging from roof repair to advanced propulsion design analysis. The ad asked, in effect, for a show of hands from companies that might be interested in setting up a plant at the Pine Bluff, Arkansas, arsenal that could process 100,000 pounds of methane phosphonyl dichloride (MPD) in the first year and up to 1.5 million pounds a year for four years after that. Despite a misspelling (it should have read "methyl" instead of "methane"), the chemists in the readership had little difficulty deciphering what the Army wanted: someone to produce enough nerve gas to fill a million or so artillery shells.

If Congress appropriates the money, the Army wants to be able to start producing by the fall of 1984 a safe-to-store-and-handle "binary" weapon, which simply means a weapon in two parts, each part harmless by itself. At Pine Bluff the Army will fluoridate the MPD, a process that increases its toxicity, and put the liquid into canisters that will be inserted into artillery shells. On the battlefield a canister of nothing more exotic than rubbing alcohol will be slipped into each shell as well. As the shell is fired, the force ruptures the two canisters and the chemicals mix. When the shell strikes its target, a powder charge bursts and spreads the nerve gas in a deadly cloud.

A ROUTINE REQUEST

The response to the ad was so meager as to be barely detectable. Only four companies answered, and the only large company among them, Monsanto, quickly said it has made a mistake. Corporate headquarters in St. Louis explained that a staffer in the Washington office had routinely sent the Army a request for more information, as he does every time he spots an ad with the word "chemical" in it. Monsanto does not want to make nerve gas. Du Pont, the largest chemical company, ignored the ad altogether. Du Pont makes plutonium for nuclear weapons at its Savannah River plant, and its Remington Arms subsidiary makes rifle bullets for the Army at a plant in Independence, Missouri. But it wants no part of nerve gas. Neither does Dow Chemical.

Some weeks after the ad ran, the Defense Department telephoned and wrote to a select list of chemical manufacturers to see if they would be interested in supplying an additional five million pounds or more of another type of nerve gas, EDMP, to be used in an aerial-bomb version of the binary weapon. MPD creates a vapor that kills through inhalation, while EDMP yields a spray that is mainly absorbed through the skin. The response was not much better. Mobil considered the job for a number of weeks, but dropped out; Union Carbide is still thinking it over.

That lack of enthusiasm will not be an insuperable problem for the military. If neces-

sary, the government can order any company that can make an essential material to do so. But it probably won't come to that. Five small companies have expressed a strong interest in the Defense Department's inquiries, and at least four of them seem to have the technical know-how to make the weapon.

Nerve gas is easy to make, uncomfortably so. It amounts to nothing more than an extraordinarily potent insecticide, a relative of the Malathion that California has been spraying on the Medfly. A German scientist, in fact, accidentally synthesized nerve gas in 1936 while making bug killers. As the name implies, the chemical attacks the central nervous system. A whiff in the lungs is enough to kill a victim within minutes. The chemical attaches itself to and cripples an essential enzyme in the body that normally breaks down acetylcholine, a natural substance that is the medium by which messages are transmitted from one nerve to another. As acetylcholine accumulates, the nervous system is convulsed by a flood of nonstop messages. Overwhelmed, it quickly fails.

Among other things, victims sweat intensely and vomit and defecate uncontrollably. Soon their diaphragms quit working and they die of asphyxiation. Even some who survive an attack may face long-term neurological and psychiatric disorders—or so scientists surmise from brain-wave studies of monkeys that have been given non-lethal doses.

For all the terror nerve gas strikes into the heart, it is by no means the instrument of unequivocal destruction the layman imagines it to be. As a vapor it dissipates quickly and as a liquid spray it can be washed off the skin before it's absorbed into the bloodstream. From a soldier's viewpoint it is among the easiest of weapons to protect against—which is, ironically, what most horrifies some of its critics. Soldiers in gas masks and coveralls can douse one another with nerve gas all day long without getting hurt. Only the confused and ill-prepared civilians downwind drop dead.

The five companies that have told the military they might be willing to make nerve gas are a diverse group. None has ever made nerve gas before, nor does any currently have a factory capable of making either of the two compounds for which the Army has advertised. Atomergic Chemetals of Plainview, New York, which with sales of close to \$15 million a year is the largest of the five, estimates that it would have to invest \$30 million in a plant to produce EDMP. Atomergic would, of course, have to take that outlay into account in making its bid. Making MPD would probably require a similar investment.

INSULATED FROM THE PUBLIC

For the most part the five companies live by taking on government and commercial jobs too specialized and too limited to catch the attention of their larger competitors. What they have in common additionally is that they are privately owned and therefore have no alarmed outside shareholders to worry about; and they don't make consumer goods, at least not under their own names, which insulates them somewhat from public outcry against chemical weapons.

Andrulis Research has a laboratory in Washington, D.C., and headquarters a few miles north in Bethesda, Maryland, where it occupies a few rooms in an anonymous stone and glass office building. Visitors state their nationality when they sign in at the reception desk, and a poster in the corridor

reminds the company's 45 employees that they may be working on classified material.

The owners are an attractive, intense, cerebral husband-and-wife team, Peter and Marilyn Andrulis, both 41 and both graduates of the University of Texas. She has a doctorate in engineering and is an authority on underwater acoustics; her talents have enabled the firm to bid on a system to monitor noise and vibrations in submarines. She is also president and owner of slightly more than half the stock—which makes Andrulis a woman-owned enterprise, and therefore on the books of the Small Business Administration a "socially and economically disadvantaged business"; if a government agency deems Andrulis a fit contractor for a project, it can award the job without competitive bidding. Peter Andrulis has a doctorate in chemistry and concentrates primarily on making anti-cancer drugs and insect sex attractants to control such pests as the gypsy moth.

Andrulis is already operating on the periphery of the chemical-weapons business. It provides backup staff for studying chemical-defense systems at the Dugway Proving Grounds in Utah. And the company also has a role in the anti-nerve-gas business. Andrulis has developed a chemical treatment for clothing that would neutralize any nerve gas that touched it; moreover, the chemical would renew itself so that the suit wouldn't have to be laundered in the substance after every attack.

Since they answered the ad, the Andrulises have begun to doubt that making nerve gas will be profitable for the company. But even if the economics work, they will be concerned about the ethics. (See box above.)

Atomergic Chemetals, housed in a two-story brick-faced building in Plainview, is a specialty company that mixes up small batches of chemicals for which there is limited demand. Atomergic's customers include bigger chemical companies as well as university laboratories and the Department of Defense. "The only reason we got interested in nerve gas is that we have a chemist on staff who was a pioneering research on the binary weapon in the early Seventies," says general manager Mel Blum, 46, who has master's degrees in several branches of chemistry from Columbia University. "He wanted to get back into the field and so we've assumed we could negotiate something to our benefit and to the government's."

Proserve Inc., situated in a corrugated metal warehouse outside Memphis, is a custom formulator of agricultural chemicals, which means it mostly turns its production lines over to big chemical companies, such as those bringing new pesticides and herbicides to market but not yet ready to go into full-scale production. It is owned by Robert Branch, 56, a chemical engineer who believes he is well qualified to work with nerve gas because of 30 years' experience producing pesticides and other toxic chemicals. Although he has no doubts about his ability to make MPD, Branch fears that the government will pass over Proserve and give the contract to a company with which it has previously done business. He has lost out on government contracts before. "The bureaucrats are afraid to try someone new, even though I might have the lowest bid," he complains. "That's what costs the taxpayers money."

The smallest of the candidates is Specialty Organics of Irwindale, California, with only nine employees and sales of about \$1 million last year. Most of those sales came

from churning out mundane chemicals that wind up as carburetor cleansers, mothballs, and deodorant cakes for urinals. But the company also works in organophosphorus chemistry, the branch that includes pesticides and nerve gas. And like Andrius, it has operated on the fringes of the nerve-gas business. A decade ago it created a chemical used in an alarm system for detecting nerve gas. Being tiny, Specialty would probably bid on only segment of a major nerve-gas project, such as developing processes for manufacturing EDMP, says business manager David McAuley.

The fifth company that has expressed an interest in the project, Program Resources of Rockville, Maryland, is distinctive because it's a management firm with no experience in chemistry. In fact, Richard J. White, 43, one of the firm's two principals, was surprised when a journalist came by to inquire about the company's interest in making nerve gas. A computer engineer by training, White hadn't known what methyl phosphonyl dichloride was. His staff had answered the ad in the Commerce Business Daily because it contained the key words "Pine Bluff."

Pine Bluff, White explains, is something that Program Resources knows about. It takes care of laboratory mice and performs some other tasks for the food and Drug Administration in Pine Bluff. Because it is familiar with the area and the local labor market, Program Resources keeps its eye out for other work in Pine Bluff. White, whose silver hair is a decade older than his chronological age and whose face is two decades younger, believes the military will ultimately pick a firm with a strong background in chemistry for the contract. But he nonetheless is a "can do" sort who maintains that if the military is interested in Program Resources, the company is interested in the project.

REMEMBERING DOW'S ANGUISH

Big Chemistry is happy to leave the field to the little guys. Even before they have to cope with the moral question raised by making nerve gas, the big companies reject it on practical grounds. The potential profit is not enough to dazzle a large company, especially since the project will last only five years. The potential damage to its image, on the other hand, is tremendous. Making nerve gas may not be any less moral than making fighter planes, but a large part of the public thinks it is, and the public can retaliate against a large company's employees, offices, and products. And any company with branches in Europe—which, of course, includes most large companies—seems particularly exposed. It is easy to imagine Europe's anti-nuclear movement becoming inflamed over nerve gas as well.

Clear in every corporate memory is the anguish that Dow Chemical went through as a result of making napalm and agent orange for the war in Vietnam. Dow maintains that it barely broke even with napalm and that the profits from the herbicide agent orange, used to defoliate the jungle, were minor, well under 1% of corporate profits. (Dow's annual earnings in those years averaged \$130 million.) What's more, to make agent orange the company had to stop producing the herbicides for some of its commercial customers.

The price Dow paid was enormous. Campus activists harassed and even locked up Dow recruiters; protestors in Washington broke into a Dow office and splattered the files with animal blood; demonstrators marched with placards reading "Dow Shalt

Not Kill", others disrupted an annual meeting. And it's not over. Vietnam veterans have sued Dow and six other manufacturers of defoliants for an estimated \$40 billion, claiming that contact with the herbicides has caused cancer in themselves and birth defects in the children they have fathered.

Dow says it cannot measure what the battle over napalm and agent orange has cost in dollars. Consumers continued to buy Saran Wrap and Dow Oven Cleaner at the same rate as before, even at the same rate as before, even at the height of the protests. But the expense in executive time, energy, and morale, the Dow has spent explaining and defending itself—effort therefore diverted from the main business of the company—has been huge.

At board meeting after board meeting in the late 1960s, directors agonized over the company's battered reputation. And the stigma lingers. Carl Gerstacker, chairman of the company during those years, serves on a citizen's committee studying multi-national businesses. "There are a lot of Presbyterian ministers on that committee," he observes. "Every time a new minister joins and finds out who I am I get looked at as though I'm some sort of monster." For its trouble Dow got a nice thanks-for-your-patriotism note from former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara—duly recorded in the company history, but not much noted anywhere else. The big chemical companies seem quite content to leave the nerve-gas wars to less battle-scarred volunteers.●

NORTH DAKOTANS HELP WITH "NOODLES FOR NEEDY"

HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. DORGAN. Mr. Speaker, the President, the Secretary of Agriculture and many Members of Congress will participate in a variety of activities on Agriculture Day, March 21, 1983. Agriculture Day celebrates the achievements of the men and women who have made our Nation the greatest producer of food in the world—the farmers of America.

I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues two North Dakota farm groups that deserve special praise.

The North Dakota Wheat Producers and the U.S. Durum Growers Association have launched a project called noodles for needy. The two groups set out late last month to collect 2,600 bushels of durum from among their members. Their plan was to process the durum into macaroni and distribute the noodles to needy people on Agriculture Day, next Monday.

The noodles for needy plan picked up speed as it was put into operation. On March 2 and 3, members of the two organizations used their own trucks to collect durum from around North Dakota. By the end of those 2 days, they had not only collected 4,460 bushels of durum—exceeding their original goal by a full 71 percent—but

also accepted checks totaling \$5,000 from about 2,500 North Dakota farmers, both members and nonmembers of the organizations.

The durum was milled into Semolina free of charge by Sam Kuhl, the manager of the State Mill and Elevator in Grand Forks, N. Dak. The Semolina was then transported on trucks donated by Glacier Trucking of Grand Forks and Buesing Brothers Trucking of Long Lake, Minn., to the firm of Noodles by Leonardo in Cando, N. Dak. Noodles by Leonardo is processing the Semolina free of charge into 100,000 pounds of elbow macaroni this week. When that job is done, the noodles will be sealed into 100,000 plastic bags donated by Strait Plastics of Bloomington, Minn., and packed into cardboard boxes donated by Champion International of Fargo, N. Dak. At the end of this week, trucks donated by Bob Knorr, the president of North Dakota Wheat Producers, will transport about half of the macaroni to Cleveland, Ohio, where it will be turned over to the Greater Cleveland Community Food Bank for distribution to the hungry people of that city. The other half of the macaroni will be distributed to community action programs in nine North Dakota cities to be given away in conjunction with the next distribution of surplus Government cheese.

The final act of generosity was the gift of two round-trip plane tickets from Bismarck to Cleveland by Republic Airlines of Minneapolis, Minn. The tickets will allow Bob Knorr of the North Dakota Wheat Producers and president Monroe Scheflo of the U.S. Durum Growers Association to be in Cleveland to present the macaroni at an Agriculture Day ceremony Monday.

The 4,460 bushels of durum represents a value of nearly \$15,000 to the farmers who donated them. But if the hungry people of North Dakota and Cleveland were to buy the 100,000 pounds of macaroni produced from the wheat, it would cost them about \$200,000.

These are not good times for America's farmers. The combination of high interest rates and low commodity prices have created a cash-flow crunch for family farmers reminiscent of the 1930's. At the same time, the continued loss of foreign markets for American agricultural products has decimated the demand for the bounty they produce. And yet, even in such difficult and uncertain times, North Dakota farmers have recognized a chance to help their fellow citizens in need, and have responded to that challenge beyond all expectations. Their act of generosity on a day meant to honor them is an inspiration to us all, and a reminder of the values of generosity, cooperation and concern that make America great.

Nearly 20 centuries have passed since Horace told the leaders of Rome that "the truly generous is the truly wise." By their unselfish generosity on a day meant to honor them, these farmers of North Dakota and their fellow citizens who acted with them have set an example that all Americans should strive to follow.●

CHEMICALS IN FOOD PRODUCTS COULD POSE THREATS TO HUMAN HEALTH

HON. JAMES J. HOWARD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Speaker, for the last month I have been studying the possibility of establishing a special commission to investigate the ramifications of modern farm animal production.

While implementing legislation is still in its developmental stages, I wanted to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article which appeared in the New York Times on March 16 titled "Residue of Chemicals in Meat, Leads to Debate on Hazards" by Marian Burros.

Among other things, the article states:

Some of the chemicals legally used in animals are drugs that make them grow more rapidly; some are drugs administered to combat certain diseases. Two of the best known of these are the antibiotics penicillin and tetracycline. There is scientific evidence that the increased presence of these antibiotics in meat diminishes their effectiveness in humans, who can build up resistance to them.

The commission established under my bill would study the problem of possible chemical contamination, the use of human antibiotics in animal feeds and the stress of farm animals. The commission would be comprised of scientists and others associated with modern farm animal production. It is my hope that the commission would bring together the numerous scientific and governmental studies on this subject and arrive at one comprehensive proposal taking into account the economic impact on both farmers and consumers.

I think my colleagues will agree with me that the time is right to undertake

such a complete and thorough study. I urge you to read this important article and join me in cosponsoring this timely legislation when it is introduced in the coming weeks.●

FERRARO CALLS FOR PEACE AND UNITY IN IRELAND

HON. GERALDINE A. FERRARO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Ms. FERRARO. Mr. Speaker, as you well know, one does not have to be Irish to celebrate St. Patrick's Day. Today, all Americans join together in honoring the Irish people and their patron saint.

St. Patrick's Day is a time of religious worship, a time of festivity, and it should be a time of peace. Unfortunately, for the people of Ireland, it is not a time of peace.

The pages of Irish history are filled with over 800 years of foreign occupation, persecution, and human rights violations. Violence and terrorism are still common occurrences in Northern Ireland. This violence is leaving scores of innocent men, women and children dead. As a mother, an attorney, and Member of Congress I find this particularly appalling and abhorrent.

As Members of Congress we should appeal to the people of Northern Ireland—Protestants and Catholics alike—to help end this senseless violence. Violence only prolongs suffering and destroys the innocent.

The situation in Northern Ireland is not hopeless. To achieve a peaceful resolution to the crisis the governments of Great Britain and the Republic of Ireland must consistently work together. Toward that end, Mr. Speaker, it is important that these governments know that they have the support of the U.S. Congress. I, therefore, ask all my colleagues to pledge themselves toward the attainment of peace, justice and unity in Ireland through peaceful negotiations between the respective nations.

I hope and pray that the time will come when all the Irish people can live in peace and unity. When that occurs, this will truly be a great day for the Irish.●

ATTITUDE, NOT LATITUDE, MORE IMPORTANT IN CELEBRATING ST. PATRICK'S DAY

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 17, 1983

● Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, for the 14th consecutive year, Christiansted, St. Croix, has had the distinction of being the southernmost point in the northern hemisphere where St. Patrick's Day is celebrated. In honor of this great saint and in tribute to the people of Ireland, citizens there take to the streets for day-long festivities.

Marching bands, brightly decorated floats, and the prevailing color of green fills the eye. It is only out of deference to my colleagues who represent communities with significant numbers of constituents of Irish American heritage that I refrain from proclaiming it the best of celebrations under the U.S. flag.

Yes, my colleagues, this "Celtic Basin Initiative" in my community is one that I invite all of you to experience. To place you in the proper frame of mind for this great day, I ask to have printed here a poem by one of that country's leading poets.

COMMUNION

(By Patricia Cullen)

I do not disturb roses by night,
but sit on the lawn alone, awaiting dawn
and the long-drawn, slow, opening of petals.
Sometimes, even the heart of the rose
opens;

a single eye,
fixed with a wry smile, meets mine.

Though I have often dragged through
streets,
eyeing the petal-spread of cities,
Improbable shades of velvet—wild sea-roses
are my favorite

Always I leave untouched, unplucked,
each petal and stem.

No rose only has one name;
each opening and closing changes it.
Suffice to see the ebb and flow of feeling.
Questions are flawed.

(Enough to know we are, and moving
safely as swans, across water).

In the wind from the sea petals fold like
fans, and stones on the sand are silk.
Communion is gradual, continuing.

Unasking, I meet the unconditional gaze of
the rose.

Into the petals of the wind I reach my
hand.●